Department of Defense

Military Manpower Training Report

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

FY

MARCH

2002

Department of Defense

Military Manpower Training Report

FY 2002

MARCH

Prepared by Defense Manpower Data Center for:

Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Readiness)
Department of the Army, Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC)
Department of the Navy, Chief of Naval Education and Training (CNET)
U.S. Marine Corps, Training and Education Command (TECOM)
Department of the Air Force, Air Education and Training Command (AETC)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MILITARY MANPOWER TRAINING REPORT, FY 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MILITARY MANPOWER TRAINING REPORT, FY 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MILITARY MANPOWER TRAINING REPORT, FY 2002

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Military Manpower Training Report describes individual institutional military training requirements. Specifically, the report compiles Department of Defense military student training data by Service component and fiscal year for each category of individual institutional training for Fiscal Years 2002 and 2003. Data for this report are compiled and submitted by the Services and are consistent with Service military manpower strengths and budget submissions as of the beginning of the fiscal year being reported. The Department of Defense's projected student training load requirements are listed below:

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE 1. Component Student Load

Service	FY 02	FY 03
Active Components		
Army	54,421	53,546
Navy	43,915	45,232
Marine Corps	21,814	21,957
Air Force	31,799	31,905
Subtotal	151,949	152,640
Reserve Components		
Army Reserve	8,810	9,858
Army National Guard	11,299	10,796
Naval Reserve	831	769
Marine Corps Reserve	2,776	2,853
Air Force Reserve	3,122	3,343
Air National Guard	4,123	4,134
Subtotal	30,961	31,753
TOTAL	**182,910**	**184,393**

♦ ♦ ♦

OVERVIEW OF TRAINING LOAD

"Training load" is the number of student-years that a Service Component received (or projects to receive) in formal institutional training and education courses during a fiscal year. The total DoD training load required for FY 2002 is 182,910. About 83 percent of this training load is for members of the Active Forces. The remaining 17 percent are training for members of Reserve Components. Whenever possible, Reserve Component personnel attend the

same classes and are provided the same instruction as Active Force personnel. Table 2 displays the distribution of training loads in FY 2002 and FY 2003 by category of training.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE 2. Distribution of Training Load

Training Category	FY 02	FY 03
Recruit Training	37,243	37,960
One-Station Unit Training (Army)	10,183	9,612
Officer Acquisition Training	18,787	19,338
Specialized Skill Training	98,686	99,142
Flight Training	5,362	5,457
Professional Development Education	12,649	12,884
TOTAL	**182,910**	**184,393**

♦ ♦ ♦

Categories of institutional training with larger shares of training load are Specialized Skill Training, Recruit Training, and the Army One-Station Unit Training, and are strongly influenced by the number of enlisted non-prior service accessions. Specialized Skill Training is the largest training category for FY 2002 with 54 percent of the Active Force and 55 percent of the Reserve Component load.

Table 3 divides the required training load for FY 2002 and FY 2003 into two parts: (1) accession-related training which provides entering personnel with the initial skills needed to perform the duties of their first military occupations; and (2) other training that is conducted to prepare members for more specialized duties in subsequent stages of their military careers.

For FY 2002, training related to new accessions amounts to about 67 percent of all training programmed for Active Components and about 87 percent for Reserve Components. These percentages of training loads dedicated to accession-related requirements highlights the priority that military services place on training new military members. Detailed information on each category of training is provided in Chapters III through VII of this report.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE 3. Accession-Related Training

(Thousands of Loads)

Load	FY 02		FY 03	
	Active	Reserve	Active	Reserve
Accession Related Load				
Recruit	28.9	8.4	29.2	8.8
One-Station Unit Training	7.0	3.1	6.1	3.5
Officer Acquisition	17.3	1.4	17.9	1.4
Initial Skill (Off & Enl)	45.8	13.5	46.9	13.3
Undergraduate Flight	3.3	0.5	3.3	0.5
Subtotal	**102.3**	**26.9**	**103.4**	**27.5**
Other Training Load				
Other Specialized Skill	35.9	3.5	35.3	3.6
Other Flight	1.4	0.2	1.4	0.3
Professional Development	12.3	0.4	12.5	0.4
Subtotal	**49.6**	**4.1**	**49.2**	**4.3**
TOTAL	**151.9**	**31.0**	**152.6**	**31.8**
Accession Related Load as a Percent of Total Load	67%	87%	68%	86%

♦ ♦ ♦

MANPOWER IN SUPPORT OF INDIVIDUAL TRAINING

Individual training establishments require manpower to conduct and support instruction, manage military schools and training centers, maintain training bases, and provide support to students, military staff members and their dependents. Chapter VIII of this report provides information about the military and civilian manpower needed for individual training. Manpower in support of individual training for FY 2002 and FY 2003 is shown in the following tables by Service and by function. Manpower data for specified Major Force Program 8 "Training, Medical and other General Personnel Activities" Program Elements are extracted for this report from Service budget submissions, reference Chapter VIII and Appendix C.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE 4. DoD Manpower in Support of Individual Training

By Service, (End Strength in Thousands)

Service	FY 02			FY 03		
	Mil	Civ	Total	Mil	Civ	Total
Army	27.8	14.5	42.3	27.8	14.1	41.9
Navy	15.9	5.5	21.4	17.7	5.2	22.9
Marine Corps	11.8	1.3	13.2	11.8	1.3	13.1
Air Force	15.8	8.2	24.0	17.2	8.1	25.3
TOTAL	**71.3**	**29.5**	**100.9**	**74.5**	**28.7**	**103.2**

Note: All individual training categories are included. The manpower includes instructors, instructional support, school/training center administration, student supervision and direct training support.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE 5. DoD Manpower in Support of Individual Training

By Function, (End Strength in Thousands)

Function	FY 02			FY 03		
	Mil	Civ	Total	Mil	Civ	Total
Conduct of Ind'l Training	56.7	12.3	69.0	59.9	12.1	72.0
Operating Support	13.3	15.7	29.0	13.5	15.3	28.8
Training Headquarters	1.3	1.5	2.9	1.2	1.3	2.5
TOTAL	**71.3**	**29.5**	**100.9**	**74.6**	**28.7**	**103.3**

♦ ♦ ♦

FUNDING IN SUPPORT OF INDIVIDUAL/INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING

Individual/Institutional Training activities reported in the Military Manpower Training Report are funded within Major Force Program 8, "Training, Medical and Other General Personnel Activities." Funding of specified Major Force Program 8 Program Elements are extracted for this report from Service budget submissions, reference Chapter IX and Appendix C, and are summarized in Tables 6 and 7.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE 6. Funding of Individual Training (All Appropriations)

By Service, (Then-Year $ in Millions)

Service	FY 02	FY 03
Army	$6,302.7	$6,329.0
Navy	4,430.5	4,481.6
Marine Corps	1,736.3	1,882.7
Air Force	4,613.6	5,091.2
TOTAL	**$17,083.1**	**$17,784.5**

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE 7. Funding of Individual Training (All Appropriations)

By Category, (Then-Year $ in Millions)

Category	FY 02	FY 03
Recruit Training	$1,525.1	$1,601.7
Officer Acquisition Training	$713.9	$752.5
Specialized Skill Training	$5,444.6	$5,598.4
Flight Training	$2,984.6	$3,226.0
Professional Development Education	$1,009.1	$1,160.0
Army One-Station Unit Training	$321.7	$320.7
Direct Training Support	$717.4	$739.7
Training Base Support	2,829.2	2,652.2
Training Management Headquarters	213.3	199.0
Reserve Component Pay and Allowance	1,324.2	1,534.5
TOTAL	**$17,083.1**	**$17,784.7**

♦ ♦ ♦

TRENDS IN INDIVIDUAL TRAINING

This section summarizes information on individual training loads, workloads, manpower and funding. Three years of actual (executed) data are provided to compare with projections for budget year(s) estimates. Please note that for various reasons unrelated to the requirements for training, Services typically are not able to execute 100 percent of their estimated training loads. Table 8 shows the actual training loads for FY 1999 through FY 2001 and projected training loads for FY 2002 and FY 2003 for each Active and Reserve Component.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE 8. Active and Reserve Training Load Trends by Service

(Thousands of Loads)

Service	Actual			Estimate	
	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
Active Components					
Army	44.8	48.6	51.5	54.4	53.5
Navy	40.5	43.3	44.5	43.9	45.2
Marine Corps	17.9	19.0	20.1	21.8	22.0
Air Force	29.3	28.3	29.6	31.8	31.9
Subtotal	132.6	139.3	145.7	151.9	152.6
Reserve Components					
Army National Guard	8.7	8.5	9.8	11.3	10.8
Army Reserve	5.9	6.3	7.9	8.8	9.9
Naval Reserve	.6	.6	.7	.8	.8
Marine Corps Reserve	2.2	2.4	2.9	2.8	2.9
Air National Guard	2.3	2.6	3.2	4.1	4.1
Air Reserve	1.0	1.1	2.6	3.1	3.3
Subtotal	20.7	21.6	27.1	31.0	31.8
TOTAL	**153.3**	**160.9**	**172.8**	**182.9**	**184.4**

♦ ♦ ♦

Table 9 shows actual training workloads conducted by Service for FY 1999 through FY 2001 and projected training workloads for FY 2002 and FY 2003. Training workload compilations include students from other Service components, DoD civilian personnel, other U.S. government agencies, as well as foreign students.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE 9. Training Workload Trends

(Thousands of Loads)

Service	Actual			Estimates	
	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
Army	64	63	70	75	75
Navy	44	46	48	47	49
Marine Corps	16	16	17	19	19
Air Force	31	31	37	40	41
TOTAL	**154**	**156**	**172**	**182**	**184**

♦ ♦ ♦

The following two tables demonstrate the Department's emphasis on improving training efficiencies. Although total training workload requirements are estimated to increase by 19 percent from FY 1999 to FY 2003, a 17 percent reduction in training manpower is estimated.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE 10. Manpower Trends in Support of Training

Combined Military and Civilian End Strengths, (In Thousands)

Service	Actual			Estimates	
	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
Army	45.4	46.3	43.5	42.3	41.9
Navy	33.9	23.1	26.2	21.4	22.9
Marine Corps	13.7	13.7	13.3	13.2	13.1
Air Force	31.2	26.3	29.3	24.0	25.3
TOTAL	**124.2**	**109.4**	**112.3**	**100.9**	**103.2**

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE 11. Individual Training Funding Trends

All Appropriations, (In Billions)

Service	Actual			Estimates	
	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
Army	5.6	5.7	6.0	6.3	6.3
Navy	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.4	4.5
Marine Corps	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.9
Air Force	3.7	4.0	4.3	4.6	5.1
TOTAL	**15.6**	**16.2**	**16.5**	**17.0**	**17.8**

♦ ♦ ♦

Chapter I: Introduction

The Necessity for Individual Training

The primary goal of individual training is to prepare military personnel to assume jobs in Active and Reserve Component organizations. Individual training is intended to provide individual service members the skills and knowledge that will qualify them to perform effectively as members of operational military units. One of the cornerstones of personnel readiness is conducting effective individual training at Service Training Institutions. Maintaining excellence in our individual training at Service Training Institutions during peacetime helps assure that military personnel will be ready to respond in a national emergency.

Training Requirements and Manpower Requirements

Requirements for the training and education of military personnel are derived from national security objectives. The Report of the Secretary of Defense to the Congress, the Defense Manpower Requirements Report, and the Military Manpower Training Report (MMTR) describe the progression from national security objectives to training load requirements. The Report of the Secretary of Defense explains the relationship between the threat and the forces designed to cope with the threat. The Defense Manpower Requirements Report describes the requirement for trained manpower to man the forces. Using this trained manpower requirement as its starting point, the Military Manpower Training Report details the amount of training needed and describes the "training demand" in terms of student loads. The Defense Manpower Requirements Report and the Military Manpower Training Report are mutually supportive. Data in the two reports, however, is not interchangeable or directly comparable. The principal reason for this difference is that the Defense Manpower Requirements Report focuses upon requested strength on the last day of fiscal years (that is, end strength), whereas the Military Manpower Training Report focuses upon cumulative student man-years (a concept more comparable to average strength).

Institutional Training Funding

Institutional Training activities reported in the MMTR are funded within several of the nine categories of the Central Training Infrastructure (2A2T). Institutional training discussed throughout this report is also conducted under the funding of Major Force Program 8, "Training, Medical and Other General Personnel Activities." These overall Defense resource management systems include the funding of various other training activities that are not included in the MMTR such as command managed training programs, civilian employee education and training, voluntary/off-duty education, and

dependent education. Funds to support these programs are not within the purview of the MMTR.

Additionally, the MMTR differs in structure from budget justification submissions. Budget justifications focus on explaining how, by whom, and why money is to be spent. Each Service prepares budgets for their training workload (training that they will conduct in their institutions) which includes funding required to train personnel from other Services in addition to their own personnel. By contrast, the MMTR details the Services' requirements for student man-years of training (training loads) regardless of the training establishment that conducts the training. For example, Marine Corps personnel being trained by the Army are treated as part of the Marine Corps training load in the MMTR since students are being trained to fill Marine Corps requirements. However, in budget justification documents and the Institutional Training Readiness Report (ITRR), Marine Corps students attending Army schools are included in the Army training workload.

Personnel undergoing individual training and education are classified for manpower accounting purposes as trainees, students, or cadets. The term "trainees" is generally used for all enlisted personnel in Recruit Training and Initial Skill Training. "Cadets" (or "midshipmen" in the case of the Naval Academy) are members being educated at one of the Service academies. All others receiving individual training and education are identified as "students." The distinction is not relevant for the purposes of this report, but may be relevant for budget submissions and other reports. Students undergoing individual education and training at Active Component institutions include:

- Active Component officers, warrant officers, noncommissioned officers, enlisted personnel, and Service academy cadets and midshipmen.
- Reserve Component officers, warrant officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted members on active duty for training.
- DoD civilian employees, other federal service employees, government contractor employees, and foreign service members.

Definition of "Individual Training and Education"

This report covers "individual training and education" activities of the Department of Defense; that is, the training of individual military members in formal courses conducted by active component organizations whose primary mission is training. This training is different from training activities conducted by operational units incidental to their primary combat, combat support, or combat service support missions. Training conducted within operational units (including the training of crews and teams) is not included in the training loads discussed in this report. Additionally, training accomplished through non-resident training programs, such as On-the-Job Training (OJT) and distance/

distributed learning, are not included in the training loads discussed in this report (even though these non-resident programs may substitute for all or parts of formal/resident course training requirements). "Individual education and training" reported in the MMTR includes formal military and technical training and professional education conducted by Active Component schools under centralized Training Command control.

DEFINITIONS OF INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING CATEGORIES

Chapters III through VII of this report address each of the major categories of institutional training. These major categories are briefly defined below. Each chapter will more fully describe the training category and its sub-categories, the required training loads, and the training methodology.

Recruit Training provides introductory physical conditioning and military training to indoctrinate and acclimate enlisted entrants in each of the Services to military life. It is also known as basic training.

One-Station Unit Training (OSUT) an Army training program that meets the training objectives of both Recruit Training and Specialized Skill Training in certain skill areas through a single course conducted by a single training institution. It includes elements of two categories of training and is treated separately in this report.

Officer Acquisition Training provides education and training that leads to commissioning in one of the Services, also known as pre-commissioning training. Examples are programs of the Service academies and Officer Candidate/Training Schools. Students not included in Active Component end strengths, such as Reserve Officers' Training Corps cadets, are not included in training load compilations in the MMTR.

Specialized Skill Training provides personnel with initial job qualification skills and new or higher levels of skill in military specialties or functional areas to meet specific job requirements. This category includes the sub-categories of initial skill, skill progression, and functional training.

Flight Training provides initial individual flying skills needed by pilots, navigators, and naval flight officers to permit them to function effectively upon assignment to operational aircraft flight programs and/or operational units. Flight training programs culminate in an officer receiving "wings" and being categorized as a "designated" or "rated" officer. Postgraduate flying training on operational aircraft or conducted by operational units is beyond the purview of the MMTR institutional training reporting requirements.

Professional Development Education includes educational courses conducted at Service schools or at civilian institutions to broaden the outlook and knowledge of military personnel or to impart knowledge in advanced academic disciplines to meet

Service requirements. Instruction of this type prepares individuals for progressively more demanding assignments, particularly for higher command and staff positions.

Determining Training Requirements and Training Load

The amount and type of training to be conducted in the Department of Defense is the product of a series of calculations. The process begins with the determination of the requirement for military personnel with specific skills to fill positions in the approved or projected force. The Services, over the years, have developed detailed, systematic methods of determining the manpower needed to man and support the forces. These estimates take into account probable rates of change to the current inventory -- through reenlistment, promotion, discharge, death, retirement, or other causes. These estimates are based on the best historical information available, tempered by judgment of how future personnel policies, the state of the economy, behavioral patterns, and other factors (many of them difficult to predict) will affect the probabilities that a trained individual will remain in the Service. From these manpower requirements the need for trained personnel with specific skills can then be derived. For example, a given force structure establishes the number of trained enlisted personnel needed. The number of authorized positions within that force structure for radar technicians establishes the basic requirement for trained personnel with that skill. This process is repeated periodically for all skills and skill levels for each Service, for both officer and enlisted skills. The total of all personnel in all skills needed to perform all the jobs in the force at a point in time represents the total requirement for trained manpower to fill current and projected skill shortages for that time.

The requirement for the training of personnel to maintain the skill inventory becomes part of the workload of the Service training establishments. Training load is measured by Component in terms of the cumulative military student-years, or training load. The training load for a given period is a measure of the amount of training to be accomplished. It is also a basis for establishing the requirement for resources (manpower, funds, materiel, and facilities) needed to support the training to be conducted by a Service.

Training load for a given period is the cumulative student strength for the period, roughly equal to man-years. The total training load is the sum of the loads for all the individual courses. Training loads for individual courses are calculated from the following factors:

- The length of the course;
- The desired number of graduates, or output, of the course; and
- The number of entrants, or inputs, into the course required in order to obtain the desired output. This depends on the pattern of attrition for the course.

Training load is computed by the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Entrants} + \text{Graduates}}{2} \times \text{Course Length}^{1} = \text{Load}$$

[1] Training time is expressed as a fraction of a year

This formula is the basic method for computing the training loads discussed in this report, although details in some calculations may differ slightly among the Services and among the training categories. Training load data is calculated by class and aggregated by course and training category. Fractions of carryover classes conducted during the year are included as though they were separate classes. Individuals remaining in class at the end of a period are not counted as graduates, nor are individuals already in a class at the beginning of a period counted as entrants. If attrition does not occur at a uniform rate (as is frequently the case) and the rate and phasing of that attrition can be specified, more complex formulas and computer routines are used to estimate training loads.

ACCURACY IN PROJECTING TRAINING LOADS

Training load requirements are estimated well in advance of the period when the training is actually conducted. While loads for some long lead-time programs, such as the Service Academies, can be predicted with considerable accuracy, there are many uncertainties in projecting training loads. Some of the causes of the uncertainty are:

- Unanticipated changes in end strength levels and force structure, requiring adjustment of the skill inventory and the mix of courses in the training load.
- Unpredictability of individual decisions to enlist, re-enlist, or retire. These factors may lead to unanticipated changes in the skill inventory, requiring changes in the composition or size of training loads or to shifts of portions of the training load from one fiscal period to the following period.
- Changes in attrition rates and patterns, causing unprogrammed fluctuations in training rates and loads.
- The process of projecting training loads may be further complicated by the seasonal and cyclical nature of new accessions to the Services. By forecasting training needs as far as possible into the future and continuously reviewing and adjusting training load requirements, the Services adapt the training system to changing conditions. Projections are subject to change. Adjustments are inevitable -- in fact, necessary -- for good management.

PROGRAMMED TRAINING LOADS BY COMPONENT AND CATEGORY

The following two tables display by category the required training loads projected for FY 2002 and FY 2003. The loads for each period are shown by component and by each of the major categories of training.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE I-1. Military Training Student Loads, Fiscal Year 2002

By Component and Major Training Category

Service	Recruit	One-Station Unit Training	Officer Acquisition Training	Specialized Skill Training	Flight Training	Prof. Dev. Education	Total
Active Forces							
Army	8,278	7,042	5,311	28,617	909	4,264	54,421
Navy	9,062	0	5,904	26,068	1,455	1,426	43,915
Marine Corps	7,315	0	732	11,610	507	1,650	21,814
Air Force	4,232	0	5,397	15,401	1,832	4,937	31,799
Subtotal	28,887	7,042	17,344	81,696	4,703	12,277	151,949
Reserve Components							
Army Nat'l Gd	2,860	2,419	62	5,594	271	93	11,299
Army Reserve	3,081	722	129	4,756	33	89	8,810
Naval Reserve	406	0	0	409	0	16	831
Marine C. Rsv	1,262	0	0	1,465	0	49	2,776
Air Force Rsv	232	0	1,232	1,443	135	80	3,122
Air Nat'l Gd	515	0	20	3,323	220	45	4,123
Subtotal	8,356	3,141	1,443	16,990	659	372	30,961
TOTAL	**37,243**	**10,183**	**18,787**	**98,686**	**5,362**	**12,649**	**182,910**

♦ ♦ ♦

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE I-2. Military Training Student Loads, Fiscal Year 2003

By Component and Major Training Category

Service	Recruit	One-Station Unit Training	Officer Acquisition Training	Specialized Skill Training	Flight Training	Prof. Dev. Education	Total
Active Forces							
Army	7,957	6,097	5,619	28,533	905	4,435	53,546
Navy	9,464	0	6,127	26,692	1,519	1,430	45,232
Marine Corps	7,485	0	733	11,593	527	1,619	21,957
Air Force	4,296	0	5,419	15,401	1,749	5,040	31,905
Subtotal	29,202	6,097	17,898	82,219	4,700	12,524	152,640
Reserve Components							
Army Nat'l Gd	2,907	2,327	63	5,042	370	87	10,796
Army Reserve	3,226	1,188	124	5,195	30	95	9,858
Naval Reserve	341	0	0	412	0	16	769
Marine C. Rsv	1,308	0	0	1,508	0	37	2,853
Air Force Rsv	451	0	1,233	1,443	136	80	3,343
Air Nat'l Gd	525	0	20	3,323	221	45	4,134
Subtotal	8,758	3,515	1,440	16,923	757	360	31,753
TOTAL	**37,960**	**9,612**	**19,338**	**99,142**	**5,457**	**12,884**	**184,393**

♦ ♦ ♦

CHAPTER II: TRAINING PATTERNS

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The development of Service members through formal training, education, and practical experience generally follows a common pattern. New Service members (or, in the case of some Officer Acquisition Training, prospective Service members) first receive training designed to develop the basic attributes of the members of their Service. In most cases, a graduate of the initial training is then taught the skills required for a military job at the lowest skill level. Service members who do not remain beyond their initial enlistments or obligated terms of service do not, in most cases, receive additional formal training. Those who remain, the career members, will further develop their military knowledge and technical skills through experience in military jobs augmented with training or education needed to prepare them for more responsible positions. During their terms of service, military personnel are also encouraged, as their military assignments may permit, to improve themselves through off-duty and voluntary education programs. This combination of job experience, training and education is essential to the development of a military force that is capable of carrying out the national security mission.

Enlisted personnel usually work in relatively specialized skill fields, whereas the duties of officers, particularly those in the career force, call for broader expertise. For these reasons, the training and education patterns of officers and enlisted personnel differ and will be discussed separately in the following sections of this chapter.

In addition to training members of the active forces, the Service training establishments also train members of the Reserve Components. Reserve Component training, as part of individual training and education involves Reservists and Guardsmen who are on active duty for formal school training. It does not include training of Reserve Component members provided under the following circumstances:

- Training received by individuals while on extended active duty serving with an active component (this training is included in active force aggregates);
- On-the-Job Training (OJT) or other individual training conducted by Reserve units;
- Training received while on annual active duty for training, except if provided through courses conducted by the active training establishment; or

- Training received while the individual is not in an active military status. (As a minor exception, some Reserve and Guard technicians attend military schools in Civil Service status.)

Training of members of the Reserve Components will comprise 17 percent of all individual training and education in FY 2002.

OFFICER TRAINING PATTERNS

Each Service has developed career patterns to prepare its officers to assume progressively higher command and staff responsibilities. These career patterns are composed of operational assignments during which the officers learn their profession through experience and periodic individual training and education. This provides them with the knowledge and skills needed for progressively more demanding follow-on assignments.

Officer training and education can be divided into three types. First, each Service maintains a progressive system of professional military education. This education is related more to the increasing responsibilities associated with career progression and promotion than to the individual's current assignment or specialty. The primary topics are the study of officership and the command and staff knowledge required of all professional military officers. The second type of education and training includes the many skill-producing courses that enable the officer to perform immediately upon assignment to a specialized or functional area. These courses vary in length from a few days to several months. They present, for the most part, strictly job-oriented training and are often orientation or refresher courses. Third, the Services provide selected officers with advanced academic education, either in-house or at civilian institutions, to meet specific requirements for officers educated in technical, scientific, engineering, and managerial fields. Officers also participate in a variety of other educational programs, many on a part-time basis, usually with the student sharing in the cost.

Training and education for career officers involves one or more of the types of training and education described above and follows the general patterns outlined below. The patterns vary among the Services to some extent, and not all officers will participate in all of the schooling described. The number of officers participating in schooling becomes progressively smaller, and participation more selective and demanding, as officers move through their careers.

Generally, non-career officers (those who are expected to serve only an initial tour of active duty) receive training only at the entry level. In some cases, lengthy skill-oriented training (such as pilot training) results in a commensurably longer active duty obligation.

Entry Level Training. Initial officer training is Service-oriented and intended to prepare officers for duties at the lowest operational level, i.e., company, squadron, or ship. Newly commissioned Army officers will attend a basic course conducted by the particular branch of the Army, such as infantry, armor or artillery. Navy ensigns are usually assigned to school training based on their warfare specialty. All newly commissioned Marine Corps officers attend the Basic School. A newly commissioned officer in the Air Force may go to Flight Training or training in a technical specialty.

Career Training. After some operational experience, the career officer requires further professional military education to prepare for service at the next level; for example, as a unit commander or a headquarters staff officer. In the Army this entails a return to branch school for more advanced training. Navy officers at this stage in their careers may attend a school in a specialty appropriate to their future assignments. A Marine Corps officer would normally attend the Amphibious Warfare School. An Air Force officer could be selected for the Squadron Officer School.

To satisfy Service requirements and as a further step in professional development, some officers are selected for participation in an advanced academic educational program at a civilian institution or at one of the two Service technical institutes, the Naval Postgraduate School and the Air Force Institute of Technology. Selected Army officers may attend the Advanced Military Studies program at the School of Advanced Military Studies.

Intermediate Service Schools. As officers progress (between six and sixteen years of service, depending on Service criteria) they are ready for the next level of professional military education. These schools prepare officers for command and staff responsibilities in preparation for assuming higher responsibilities. Officers are competitively selected to attend each Service's program.

Senior Service Colleges. Little technical training is provided after the intermediate years. The final level of professional military education is that of the Senior Service Schools (the war colleges) for which attendance is highly selective. The Army, Navy, and Air Force each have a war college. In addition, there is the National Defense University, consisting of the National War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and the Capstone Course for general officers. Officers graduating from the Senior Service Schools have the academic foundation required for command and staff positions at the highest level. The different curricula of these schools reflect the different missions of the Services. In some instances Reserve officers are able to attend Senior Service Schools in residence. The schools also offer a non-resident course that consists of correspondence studies and resident phases.

ENLISTED TRAINING PATTERNS

Recruit Training introduces new enlistees to military life. Following this indoctrination, they will follow one of three possible avenues dictated by their respective component's requirements:

- Initial Skill Training that prepares the enlistee for an initial duty assignment;
- Direct assignment to first duty unit based on skill already acquired in civilian life; or
- Direct assignment to first duty unit for OJT.

The Army One-Station Unit Training (OSUT) program is a variation of the first of these three avenues, since it combines Recruit and Initial Skill Training into a single course followed by assignment to an operational unit.

The expected distribution of Active Recruit Training graduates for FY 2002 is shown in the following table.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE II-1. Disposition of Active Recruit Training Graduates

FY 02 Disposition	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
To Initial Skill Training	99%	77%	100.0%	100%
To Duty Assignment (Civilian-Acquired Skill)	1%	0%	0.0%	0%
To Duty Assignment (On-the-Job-Training)	0%	23%	0.0%	0%
TOTAL	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

♦ ♦ ♦

As the table indicates, most enlisted personnel receive formal Initial Skill Training to provide them with a basic military skill. This combination of Recruit Training and Initial Skill Training (or Army OSUT) turns civilians into Service members qualified to fill positions in Active or Reserve units.

During their initial enlistment, personnel normally receive no further formal skill training but gain experience through OJT training in the work environment. The

major exception is Navy training, conducted by fleet training centers in such shipboard duties as fire fighting.

After reenlistment, individuals may be selected for attendance at a journeyman level course in their specific occupational area. This training emphasizes the appropriate military applications for the skills being taught. Most enlisted personnel are given the opportunity to attend Non-Commissioned Officer (NCO) professional development training programs that prepare them for increased supervisory and leadership responsibilities.

Enlisted personnel attend regularly programmed specialized courses when circumstances require it. For example, when new equipment or systems are introduced into a Service, senior level enlisted personnel need to be formally trained in their operation and maintenance techniques. Selected Active and Reserve senior enlisted personnel attend schools, such as the Army's Sergeants Major Academy and Air Force's Senior NCO Academy, which are on the NCO level, similar in purpose to the Intermediate and Senior Service Schools in the officer education system.

CHAPTER III: RECRUIT AND ARMY ONE-STATION UNIT TRAINING

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Recruit Training is the basic indoctrination training given to enlisted personnel upon their initial entry into military service. Recruit Training provides an orderly transition from civilian to military life, instruction in the required basic skills, and motivation to become dedicated and productive. Training in each of the Services emphasizes discipline, military rules, social conduct, physical conditioning and development of self-confidence. Beyond these common objectives, Recruit Training in each Service is designed to meet the particular training requirements of that Service that reflect the Service's mission. Graduates of Recruit Training have the basic knowledge and skills required to qualify them, after formal or on-the-job training in a particular skill, for service in an operational unit of the parent Service.

Army One-Station Unit Training (OSUT) is unique in that it combines Recruit Training and Initial Skill Training in certain skills into a single course conducted by a single training unit at a single training installation. OSUT therefore includes elements of two major training categories; consequently, it is treated separately at the end of this chapter. OSUT training loads are displayed separately in Tables III-5 and III-6 at the end of this chapter. OSUT training loads are not included within Recruit Training tables neither in this chapter nor in Specialized Skill training loads displayed in Chapter V.

RECRUIT TRAINING LOADS

The training loads for each component of each Military Service are shown in Table III-1 on the following page. As accessions have returned to the levels required for each Service to sustain authorized end strengths and support enlisted career force planning, Recruit Training loads have increased. For FY 2001 Marine Corps accession requirements were lowered as a result of significantly fewer Active Service losses.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE III-1. Recruit Training Load Trends

Service Component	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
Army							
Active	7,524	6,119	7,043	8,521	8,593	8,278	7,957
Reserve	1,924	1,819	2,254	2,266	2,640	3,081	3,226
National Guard	2,295	2,300	2,711	2,719	3,015	2,860	2,907
Navy							
Active	8,304	8,558	9,052	9,932	9,517	9,062	9,464
Reserve	140	182	236	244	287	406	341
Marine Corps							
Active	7,749	7,281	7,223	7,225	6,595	7,315	7,485
Reserve	1,397	1,273	1,245	1,281	1,225	1,262	1,308
Air Force							
Active	3,718	3,544	3,671	3,943	3,942	4,232	4,296
Reserve	57	137	129	161	204	232	451
National Guard	243	349	348	461	572	515	525
Total							
Active	27,295	25,502	26,989	29,621	28,647	28,887	29,202
Reserve/Guard	6,056	6,060	6,923	7,132	7,943	8,356	8,758
TOTAL	**33,351**	**31,562**	**33,912**	**36,753**	**36,590**	**37,243**	**37,960**

NOTE: In this table and in all subsequent tables in this report, training loads for the years prior to and including FY 2001 data are actual, FY 2002 and FY 2003 are estimated.

♦ ♦ ♦

Table III-1 does not include Army One-Station Unit Training loads.

RECRUIT TRAINING

Table III-2 displays the average Recruit Training loads for FY 2000 and FY 2001, and the number of entrants (input) and graduates (output) for FY 2002 and FY 2003. Data are shown separately for each component of each Service.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE III-2. Recruit Training Input, Output, and Load

Service Component	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	8,521	8,593	48,179	45,244	8,278	45,428	44,260	7,957
Reserve	2,266	2,640	18,184	16,121	3,081	18,283	17,553	3,226
National Gd	2,719	3,015	16,619	15,234	2,860	16,498	15,805	2,907
Navy								
Active	9,932	9,517	49,396	42,481	9,062	51,588	44,366	9,464
Reserve	244	287	4,596	4,221	406	6,249	5,823	341
Marine Corps								
Active	7,225	6,595	34,239	29,331	7,315	35,038	30,022	7,485
Reserve	1,281	1,225	5,903	5,069	1,262	6,124	5,256	1,308
Air Force								
Active	3,943	3,942	36,450	34,081	4,232	37,000	34,595	4,296
Reserve	161	204	2,000	1,870	232	3,886	3,634	451
National Gd	461	572	4,437	4,149	515	4,518	4,224	525
DoD								
Active	29,621	28,647	168,264	151,137	28,887	169,054	153,243	29,202
Rsv/Gd Total	7,132	7,943	51,739	46,664	8,356	55,558	52,295	8,758
TOTAL	**36,753**	**36,590**	**220,003**	**197,801**	**37,243**	**224,612**	**205,538**	**37,960**

♦ ♦ ♦

RATIONALE FOR RECRUIT TRAINING

The underlying philosophy of Recruit Training is that the demands of military service are fundamentally different from those of civilian life. Military service requires a high level of discipline and physical fitness, a homogeneous outlook, and an ability to live and work as part of a highly structured organization. There are few parallels in civilian society to the demands of military service. Each recruit, therefore, must be transformed into a member of the military team in order to function effectively in the military environment. The attitudes, habits, and basic skills formed in Recruit Training are the foundation of a cohesive military organization. Later training provides the skills and knowledge needed for specific jobs. Recruit Training shapes civilian entrants into dedicated members of their Military Services with the potential for further development.

The major determinants of Recruit Training loads are the total number of people entering service who must receive Recruit Training (input), the length of the training

course, and projected patterns of attrition. Course length and attrition are discussed later in this chapter. The following two sections discuss inputs: (1) inputs of active duty personnel, and (2) inputs of members of the Reserve Components on active duty for initial training.

ACTIVE DUTY INPUT

The annual recruiting objective for active duty enlistees without prior military service is a function of the following factors:

- Current trained enlisted strengths.
- Number of enlisted personnel currently in training.
- Projected enlisted losses through separations or other reasons, e.g., desertion, death, acceptance of a commission, retirement, etc.
- Projected prior-service enlistments, i.e., the return from civilian life of former Service members.
- The projected requirement for trained enlisted personnel.

"Trained strength" is the number of personnel required to fill "structure" spaces, i.e., positions in military organizations that require specific grades and skills, and individual "pipeline" spaces, such as transients en route between assignments. The Defense Manpower Requirements Report contains a full discussion of how military manpower requirements are determined. The projected trained strength requirement is compared with the projected trained strength inventory to forecast future skill and strength imbalances. Future shortages that are not expected to be satisfied, either by prior service enlistees or Service members currently in skill training courses, determine the training output needed to man the force with trained personnel. To determine the necessary input to achieve this output, an allowance must be made for the number of students entering a course of instruction who fail to complete it. The total input requirement is increased to compensate for expected attrition losses.

Training organizations attempt to manage inputs to achieve the most efficient use of training staff personnel and training facilities. However, the phasing of inputs may at times be varied in order to take advantage of the best recruiting periods for maintaining quality and quantity.

Historically, the highest accessions occur in June through September and in January, a reflection of the civilian academic calendar. Enlistments increase (1) shortly after high school graduation, (2) when peers return to school in the fall, and (3) after the results of the first term of college academic work are announced.

The Services must be able to accept most prospective enlistees when they are ready to enter service. Requiring enlistees to enter military service in phases with requirements and on an even flow-basis would result in the loss of many potential enlistees to other sources of employment. Accepting enlistees as they become available, however, requires a training structure capable of accommodating surges of enlistments.

Reserve Component Input

Persons enlisting in the National Guard and Reserve forces without active duty experience require the same Recruit Training as active duty enlistees, and for the same reasons. Recruit Training loads for the Reserve Components are based on the same factors as active force loads. Guard and Reserve trainees, while in Recruit Training, are mingled with active duty trainees in units so that their training is identical.

Reserve Component recruits form a significant part of the workload of the active Recruit Training establishment. Recruit Training for the Reserve and Guard will account for 22 percent of all DoD Recruit Training in FY 2002. Reserve Component training accounts for 31 percent of all Army One-Station Unit Training programmed for FY 2002.

Planning considerations for Reserve Component personnel are essentially similar to those for the active force. Detailed phasing of this training is complicated, however, by the additional consideration of civilian employment or school commitments for these personnel. For this reason, a pool of personnel who have enlisted but who have not yet attended initial training is normal. This backlog is kept within a reasonable size.

Course Length and Course Content

Enlisted training loads depend not only upon the numbers of entrants but also on the extent of skills required of entering enlisted personnel. Enlisted personnel attain those skills in Recruit Training and in Specialized Skill Training. Recruit Training course lengths are determined in part by how much of the required training is to be provided during the Recruit Training phase and how much is to be deferred to later training. Due to the differences in their missions, the Services take somewhat different approaches in establishing the content and length of their Recruit Training courses.

Recruit Training in each of the Services covers four areas: (1) some in-processing and testing; (2) introduction into Service life; (3) instruction in military courtesy, discipline, and hygiene; and (4) fundamental military-related training involving physical fitness, military drill, and self-defense. In addition, each Service provides training in military skills that should be possessed by most members of that Service. The degree to which these Service-wide skills exist differs among the Services. This factor accounts for most of the differences in course content and, therefore, course length. The Services' recruit training syllabi is essentially the same for men and women, but women generally

receive less training on combat-oriented skills. Length of the standard Recruit Training course in each Service is shown in Table III-3.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE III-3. Recruit Training Course Length

In weeks

Fiscal Year	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
FY 02	8.9	10.3	12	6
FY 03	8.9	10.3	12	6

NOTE: Chart reflects average weeks of training. Actual course time may vary by a few days depending upon service requirements and training location.

♦ ♦ ♦

Army and Marine Corps Recruit Training differs from the Air Force and Navy programs because all recruits are given intensive physical conditioning and instruction in basic ground combat skills, including the use of individual weapons. The Army and Marine Corps train all enlisted personnel to achieve a basic level of qualification in ground combat skills during their Recruit Training program. Beginning in FY 1999 Army Recruit Training increased from eight to nine weeks to allow for a more intense, more rigorous soldierization and the inculcation of Army values.

The Air Force is able to accomplish Recruit Training in six weeks because the curriculum concentrates on military indoctrination subjects. Relatively little training in Service-wide occupational skills is provided, since there are few common occupational skills needed by all Air Force enlisted personnel. In addition to indoctrinating recruits to military life, the Navy course includes phases designed to prepare them for conditions in a fleet environment and common duties found on board ships.

The average length of time spent in recruit status in any of the Services may be longer than the standard course lengths discussed above. Some recruits fall behind their peers due to medical problems. Others require remedial training. A recruit may be sent to a special training unit or recycled to a following class to repeat a portion of the course.

Enlisted members of the Reserve Components without prior service receive the same basic qualification training as active service members. Each non-prior service enlistee in the Reserve Components undergoes, as a minimum, the equivalent of twelve weeks of active duty training. This is accomplished by sending the enlistee through Recruit Training and, in most cases, on to Initial Skill Training.

Many Army Guardsmen and Reservists are provided initial military training in certain occupational skills through One-Station Unit Training. Members of the Reserve Components have the option to split their Recruit Training from Specialized Skill Training. This option is limited to enlisted entrants who cannot attend all their required training in one block due to educational or occupational commitments. The Reserve member attends unit drills after completing Recruit Training and normally returns to active duty within one year to complete Initial Skill Training.

ATTRITION IN RECRUIT TRAINING

A final factor in the computation of loads is the projection of the rate and timing of attrition. Recruits may fail to complete training for medical reasons, inability to absorb the instruction, lack of motivation, disciplinary problems, or a variety of administrative causes, such as discharge for fraudulent enlistment or family hardship.

The table below shows projected attrition rates, which remain the same as the FY 2001 MMTR projections for the Marine Corps and the Air Force. The Army and Navy project increased attrition in FY 2002 from 6.6% and 9.0% respectively.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE III-4. Recruit Training Attrition Projections

Active and Reserve Combined

Fiscal Year	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
FY 02	7.0%	14.0%	16.8%	7.9%
FY 03	7.1%	14.0%	16.8%	7.9%

♦ ♦ ♦

The timing of attrition varies from situation to situation. In the case of slow learners or individuals that have difficulty in adjusting to military life, trainees usually are reentered or given special instruction. Those who do not respond adequately may not become attrition losses until late in the course.

ARMY ONE-STATION UNIT TRAINING

The Army's One-Station Unit Training (OSUT) program combines Recruit Training and Initial Skill Training into a single continuous course (primarily for male soldiers in selected combat arms Military Occupational Specialties (MOSs) and male and female soldiers in selected combat support MOSs). This report treats OSUT separately rather than arbitrarily breaking it into two segments.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE III-5. OSUT Training Load

Service Component	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
Army							
Active	5,400	5,925	5,503	5,719	5,924	7,042	6,097
Reserve	475	396	411	518	607	722	1,188
National Guard	1,974	1,877	1,922	1,835	2,104	2,419	2,327
TOTAL	**7,849**	**8,198**	**7,836**	**8,072**	**8,635**	**10,183**	**9,612**

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE III-6. OSUT Training Input, Output, and Load

Service Component	FY 02			FY 03		
	Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army						
Active	25,782	23,138	7,042	21,884	20,503	6,097
Reserve	2,882	2,243	722	4,972	3,695	1,188
National Guard	10,650	9,067	2,419	9,573	8,771	2,327
TOTAL	**39,314**	**34,448**	**10,183**	**36,429**	**32,969**	**9,612**

♦ ♦ ♦

In FY 2002 approximately 15 percent of Army Active and Reserve Component entrants will be trained under OSUT. OSUT is conducted for 12 military occupational specialties within the six major skill areas described in Table III-7. Four courses are offered within each OSUT specialty.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE III-7. OSUT Training Time

(In weeks)

Skill Area	Training Time
Infantry a/	13 weeks, 3 days
Artillery	14 weeks, 4 days
Armor	15 weeks
Engineer b/	14 weeks
Military Police b/	17 weeks
Chemical b/	19 weeks

a/ 11M soldiers require an additional 3 weeks of training for heavy vehicle track qualifications.

b/ Skill areas open for female soldiers

♦ ♦ ♦

OSUT training was increased by one week, effective October 1998, to allow a more intense, more rigorous soldierization and the inculcation of Army core values. In general OSUT requires less training time than the separate recruit training and initial skill training courses that it replaces. The time required to complete Recruit Training and the Initial Skill Training in separate courses for these skills would be about 4 weeks longer, including the time required to move the trainee from one training organization to another. The shorter OSUT course lengths provide a significant saving in trainee man-years and, consequently, in trainee pay, allowances, and supports costs.

CHAPTER IV: OFFICER ACQUISITION TRAINING

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Officer Acquisition Training consists of training and education programs leading to a commission in one of the Military Services. These programs fulfill the need both for junior officer entrants into the career force and for non-career junior officers in the force structure. Officer Acquisition Training programs produce officers for both the Active forces and the Reserve Components.

ROTC AND HEALTH PROFESSIONS ACQUISITION PROGRAMS

The total training loads in Table IV-2 on the following page do not include two types of Officer Acquisition Training: the Army, Navy, and Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) programs and the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship program. Students who make up the training loads discussed in this report are either members of the active forces or members of the Reserve Components being trained on active duty by the active establishments. ROTC and Health Professions Scholarship students are not in active military status, but features of the programs are discussed in this chapter to provide a complete account of Officer Acquisition Training. Table IV-1 shows the number of participants in these programs.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE IV-1. Average Enrollees, Senior ROTC

Service	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
Army	29,906	26,873	28,242	29,754
Navy	5,771	5,579	5,985	6,045
Air Force	9,090	12,407	15,329	14,929
TOTAL	**44,767**	**44,859**	**49,556**	**50,728**

♦ ♦ ♦

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE IV-2. Total Officer Acquisition Training Load

Service/ Component	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
Army							
Active	4,857	4,765	4,736	4,797	4,939	5,311	5,619
Reserve	124	130	137	111	104	129	124
National Guard	56	56	56	51	65	62	63
Navy							
Active	5,527	5,606	5,530	5,622	5,868	5,904	6,127
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marine Corps							
Active	462	665	643	536	771	732	733
Reserve	146	135	43	0	0	0	0
Air Force							
Active	5,238	5,133	7,697	7,711	5,317	5,397	5,419
Reserve	1,477	1,646	27	33	1,089	1,232	1,233
National Guard	3	5	4	6	8	20	20
Total							
Active	16,084	16,169	18,606	18,666	16,895	17,344	17,898
Reserve/Guard	1,806	1,972	267	201	1,266	1,443	1,440
TOTAL	**17,890**	**18,141**	**18,873**	**18,867**	**18,161**	**18,787**	**19,338**

♦ ♦ ♦

OFFICER REQUIREMENTS AND STRUCTURING THE OFFICER ACQUISITION PROGRAM

Requirements for new officers, like requirements for new enlisted personnel, are a product of the need for officers in the projected force as compared to the projected future inventory of officers. Properly functioning programs fill the gross number of officer entrants for any given year and provide an even flow of sufficient new officers to each Service to avoid the emergence of unmanageable shortages and overages by age and grade in the future. Each of the Services uses a mix of sources for new officers.

Officer Acquisition Training may be divided into six separate programs:

- Service Academies
- ROTC
- Officer Candidate Schools
- Off-Campus Commissioning Programs
- Other Enlisted Commissioning Programs
- Health Professions Acquisition Programs

Each of these programs has different characteristics. The Service Academies and ROTC programs, for example, provide a stable input of officers, but require long lead-times before changes in output can be made. Officer candidate programs, on the other hand, can quickly respond to increased or decreased requirements for officers. The Services exploit these differences in planning and executing their officer procurement programs. In addition to these practical considerations, having a variety of commissioning sources opens officership opportunities to a wider segment of the population.

SERVICE ACADEMIES

The mission of each of the Service Academies (United States Military Academy, United States Naval Academy, and United States Air Force Academy) is to meet a portion of the long-range requirement for career military officers. They provide instruction and experience to cadets or midshipmen so that they graduate with the knowledge and character essential to leadership and with the motivation to become career officers. Cadets and midshipmen receive a rigorous four-year undergraduate college education that includes a technically oriented core curriculum regardless of major. Successful completion of the specified academic, leadership and military requirements entitles the graduate to a Bachelor of Science degree and a commission in one of the Military Services. Up to one-sixth of each year's Naval Academy graduates may be commissioned in the Marine Corps.

The Service Academies are distinctive in that their curricula are specifically designed to prepare young men and women for duty as professional officers. The total curriculum at each Academy is designed to develop the qualities of character, intellect, and physical competence needed by the officer who may, in the course of a full career, be called upon to perform duties ranging from leading a small combat unit to advising the highest government councils. The curricula, which include the sciences, the humanities, and military and physical training, form the basis for further professional development or, when required, graduate education.

Law establishes the maximum enrollment at each of the Service Academies. This fact establishes relatively stable training loads for the Academies. Training data for the Service Academies is shown in Table IV-3.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE IV-3. Training Input, Output and Load

Service Academies

Service	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army	4,033	4,374	1,180	999	4,445	1,180	1,134	4,721
Navy	4,139	4,266	1,191	967	4,146	1,192	972	4,101
Air Force	4,183	4,101	1,220	933	4,201	1,335	1,000	4,196
TOTAL	**12,355**	**12,741**	**3,591**	**2,899**	**12,792**	**3,707**	**3,106**	**13,018**

Note: Inputs = new freshmen; Outputs = graduating seniors.

♦ ♦ ♦

Each of the Military Departments sponsors an Academy preparatory school. Marine Corps and Coast Guard personnel attend the Navy school. The mission of these schools is to provide approximately one year of intensive instruction and guidance to selected enlisted personnel in preparation for entry to the Service Academies. Students compete for nominations by the Secretarises of the Military Departments and from other sources. The Naval Academy Preparatory School also provides instruction to candidates for the Marine Corps Enlisted Commissioning Education Program during the summer months. Training load data for the Academy preparatory schools is shown in Table IV-4.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE IV-4. Training Input, Output and Load

Academy Preparatory Schools

Service	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army	183	173	235	171	175	235	171	175
Navy	233	289	285	213	252	285	213	252
Marine Corps	23	17	25	18	23	25	18	23
Air Force	207	209	230	184	207	230	184	207
TOTAL	**646**	**688**	**775**	**586**	**657**	**775**	**586**	**657**

♦ ♦ ♦

ROTC PROGRAMS

ROTC is a long lead-time program that is the single largest source of officers for the Armed Forces. Like the Service Academies, ROTC is used to provide a relatively constant input of officers for active duty. The program is currently conducted at approximately 470 civilian colleges and universities throughout the nation. The Army,

Navy, and Air Force each sponsor a ROTC program. Up to one-sixth of the Navy ROTC graduates may be commissioned into the Marine Corps. In addition to conventional recruiting and advertising methods, scholarships and subsistence allowances are used to attract qualified students. Scholarships are awarded to young men and women who exhibit potential ability as officers and have interests in fields of projected Service needs.

There are scholarship and non-scholarship, as well as two-year and four-year, ROTC programs. The curriculum of each program is tailored to the needs of the individual Services. For example, the Navy teaches the basics of ship navigation, while the Army teaches the fundamentals of ground combat and the Air Force provides basic instruction in aerospace history and doctrine. Each of the programs includes instruction in leadership, military customs and military history, and each program provides prospective officers with a gradual transition from the civilian environment to the military environment. Each ROTC program consists of a series of regularly scheduled academic classes throughout the school year combined with mandatory summer camps or cruises that are designed to give the student realistic military experience and a first-hand view of military life.

The ROTC scholarship continues to be an important incentive to attract exceptionally qualified individuals to ROTC. The rising cost of education makes the scholarship even more attractive. The Navy will fund an average of 4,580 scholarships in FY 2002, the Army 10,280 and the Air Force 8,778.

Reduced force structure requires fewer officers and the ROTC Program is being downsized accordingly. The Army now has 270 host institutions, the Air Force has 143, and the Navy remains at 57 host institutions.

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, the ROTC program is not included in Service training loads because the students are not in an active military status. The following table shows the three Service ROTC programs.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE IV-5. Senior ROTC Programs

Fiscal Year/ Service	Beginning Enrollments	Graduates	Average Enrollments	Average Number of Scholarship Enrollees
FY 2002				
Army	28,974	3,535	28,242	10,280
Navy	5,740	1,150	5,985	4,580
Air Force	17,379	2,141	15,329	8,778
Total	**52,093**	**6,826**	**49,556**	**23,638**

TABLE IV-5. Senior ROTC Programs (Cont...)

Fiscal Year/ Service	Beginning Enrollments	Graduates	Average Enrollments	Average Number of Scholarship Enrollees
FY 2003				
Army	32,067	3,769	29,754	10,632
Navy	5,740	1,150	6,045	4,640
Air Force	15,626	2,068	14,929	9,369
Total	**53,433**	**6,987**	**50,728**	**24,641**

♦ ♦ ♦

OFFICER CANDIDATE SCHOOLS

Each of the Military Services operates an Officer Candidate School (OCS). The Air Force school is entitled Officer Training School (OTS).

Enlisted members can use this route to "rise from the ranks." The existence of OCS and the other enlisted commissioning programs covered in the next section is a significant advancement incentive to ambitious and promising enlisted personnel.

The four Services offer direct entry into OCS to selected college graduates without previous enlisted service. Some college students in highly specialized academic disciplines, such as engineering and physical sciences, cannot afford the time required to participate in ROTC. The OCS program commissions well-qualified college students who desire to become officers after graduation. The following tables show average course length and load data for Officer Candidate Schools.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE IV-6. FY02 Course Length in Weeks Officer Candidate School

Army OCS	Navy OCS	Marine Corps OCS	Air Force OTS
9	13	10	12

♦ ♦ ♦

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE IV-7. Training Input, Output, and Load

Officer Candidate Schools

Service/ Component	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	323	365	2,071	1,960	410	2,243	2,099	433
Reserve	8	9	280	239	26	325	299	22
National Guard	31	42	568	519	40	502	448	37
Navy								
Active	328	328	1,416	1,076	311	1,419	1,078	312
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marine Corps								
Active	141	119	624	468	104	628	471	105
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Air Force								
Active	181	283	945	924	270	945	924	270
Reserve	15	22	76	76	22	80	80	23
National Guard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DoD								
Active	973	1,095	5,056	4,428	1,095	5,235	4,572	1,120
Rsv/Guard	54	73	924	834	88	907	827	82
TOTAL	**1,027**	**1,168**	**5,980**	**5,262**	**1,183**	**6,142**	**5,399**	**1,202**

♦ ♦ ♦

OTHER ENLISTED COMMISSIONING PROGRAMS

The Services each have enlisted commissioning programs in addition to Officer Candidate Schools. The purposes of these programs are: (I) to provide a source of officers in specific skills with an expected high rate of retention; (2) to provide an avenue whereby enlisted personnel with proven qualifications can augment the commissioned ranks; and (3) to provide a measure of motivation to enlisted personnel. The Navy's Enlisted Commissioning Programs now number seven. A similar program, the Marine Enlisted Commissioning Education Program, has been expanded to offer degrees in technical and liberal arts academic disciplines. Students in the USAF Airman Education and Commissioning Program (AECP) major in engineering and computer science, physical science, or selected health care professions, with matriculation up to three years. The average academic time spent in the program is about 30 months. In the Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force, participants attend the

Officer Candidate School of their Service before they are commissioned. Like OCS/OTS, these education programs carry an active duty service requirement. In FY 1988 the Army began reporting the warrant officer candidate program in this category. While the other Services' participants are all on active duty, the Army's program also includes members of the Reserve and National Guard.

Table IV-8 displays load data for these programs. All participants are members of the active forces.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE IV-8. Training Input, Output, and Load

Officer Enlisted Commissioning Programs

Service	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army	141	145	1,047	1,046	166	1,092	1,111	178
Navy	922	985	987	738	1,195	919	753	1,462
Marine Corps	372	455	452	409	462	452	409	462
Air Force	90	85	22	22	58	35	30	85
TOTAL	**1,525**	**1,670**	**2,508**	**2,215**	**1,881**	**2,498**	**2,303**	**2,187**

♦ ♦ ♦

OFF-CAMPUS COMMISSIONING PROGRAMS

The only Officer Acquisition Training program off the college campus is the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class (PLC). This program provides for enlistment as a Marine Corps Reservist while the student is still an undergraduate. All PLC training takes place in the summer. For freshmen and sophomores, PLC consists of two six-week training sessions at the Marine Corps Officer Candidate School in Quantico, Virginia. Juniors attend one ten-week session. PLC students are in an active duty for training status while at OCS. This training results in a by USMC for USMC training workload.

Students participating in this program attend either one or two summer training sessions, depending upon when during their college career they were enrolled. The objective of the program is to indoctrinate, motivate and train the enrollees by providing instruction in basic military subjects, leadership and physical conditioning. PLC students are commissioned when their college degrees are conferred. Newly commissioned Marine Corps officers then attend The Basic School at Quantico, Virginia. Training data for PLC is shown in Table IV-9.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE IV-9. Training Input, Output, and Load

Platoon Leaders Class (PLC)

Service	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Marine Corps	193	180	1,200	980	143	1,200	980	143

♦ ♦ ♦

HEALTH PROFESSIONS ACQUISITION PROGRAMS

This subcategory may be conveniently divided into two parts, the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship Program and the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences Program.

The Health Professions Scholarship Program was established in 1972 by Public Law 92-426. Participants are selected from among students or those accepted for enrollment in recognized health profession schools. Participants are commissioned in Grade 0-1 in the Reserve of their parent Service, but except for a short period of annual active duty, are not in active status. They are, therefore, not included in the training loads of their Services. Upon graduation, participants must serve obligated tours of duty, the length of which depends on the length of their participation in the program. Service data is shown in Table IV-10.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE IV-10. Health Professions Acquisition Program

Fiscal Year / Service	Scholarships Awarded	Graduates
FY 02		
Army	1,487	389
Navy	1,341	369
Air Force	1,375	373
Total	**4,203**	**1,131**
FY 03		
Army	1,556	388
Navy	1,411	354
Air Force	1,440	405
Total	**4,407**	**1,147**

♦ ♦ ♦

CHAPTER V: SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Specialized Skill Training provides officer and enlisted personnel with skills and knowledge needed to perform specific jobs. Each Service has established a job structure that makes it possible to carry out assigned missions. Each Service's mission is supported by an established job structure and each position within that job structure has been analyzed to determine the skill it requires. Specialized Skill Training provides these required skills to the proper number of individuals in a phased manner so that each vacancy in the structure can be filled promptly with a qualified replacement.

Specialized Skill Training, as used in this report, is defined as:

> Initial, progression and functional training for both officer and enlisted personnel. Specialized Skill Training includes such programs as Army Advanced Individual Training, Navy Apprenticeship Training and Marine Combat Training. This training category also includes aviation-related ground training and initial enlisted leadership training other than that carried in Professional Development Education.

Army One-Station Unit Training (OSUT) provides Army personnel with job-related training in a number of skills. However, since OSUT is conducted as one course that combines Recruit and Specialized Skill Training, it is treated separately in this report (see Chapter III). OSUT loads are not included in the Specialized Skill Training loads in this chapter.

Specialized Skill Training loads for Active and Reserve Components are programmed at about 7 percent higher levels in FY 2003 than in FY 2001. The Active establishment generally trains reserve and Guard officers and enlisted personnel beyond the initial entry stage. DoD wide, the requirement to improve the technical skills of career personnel to keep pace with new equipment acquisition and modifications to the existing inventory will continue into the foreseeable future. This is reflected in the estimated Specialized Skill Training load.

Training Load data for Specialized Skill Training is shown in Table V-1.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE V-1. Specialized Skill Training Load

Service Component	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
Army a/							
Active	24,306	22,956	22,844	25,059	27,212	28,617	28,533
Reserve	3,462	3,534	3,036	3,336	4,398	4,756	5,195
National Guard	3,568	3,560	3,753	3,662	4,356	5,594	5,042
Navy							
Active	22,362	22,721	22,662	24,659	26,105	26,068	26,692
Reserve	243	519	333	378	407	409	412
Marine Corps							
Active	10,891	9,737	8,272	9,576	10,892	11,610	11,593
Reserve	1,253	1,339	864	1,055	1,652	1,465	1,508
Air Force							
Active	11,565	11,868	11,358	10,914	14,412	15,401	15,401
Reserve	1,105	592	577	632	1,101	1,443	1,443
National Guard	2,276	1,760	1,623	1,809	2,395	3,323	3,323
Total							
Active	69,124	67,282	65,136	70,208	78,621	81,696	82,219
Reserve/Guard	11,907	11,304	10,186	10,872	14,309	16,990	16,923
TOTAL	**81,031**	**78,586**	**75,322**	**81,080**	**92,930**	**98,686**	**99,142**

a/ Army One-Station Unit Training load is not included.

♦ ♦ ♦

As in the other types of training covered in this report, the demand placed on the training establishment for individuals is determined by comparing projected requirements for each skill area and skill level with the projected future inventory of trained service members.

When anticipated losses are deducted from the current inventory, shortages in various skill areas are revealed. These shortages, except for those that can be satisfied through on-the-job training, or, in a few cases, through lateral entry of individuals who already possess needed job skills from civilian life, create a demand for a phased output of trained replacement personnel. Also, estimates are made of the proportion of students in each training course who will fail to complete the course. These course attrition factors determine the inputs necessary to achieve the desired course outputs. Inputs, outputs, attrition patterns, and course lengths determine the training loads.

These factors are discussed for each sub-category of Specialized Skill Training in the remainder of this chapter.

One of the challenges facing the Reserve Components is matching an individual's occupational specialty to a specific billet. A majority of the specialties or ratings require formal school training prior to designation. Since limited availability for active duty prevents members of the Selected Reserve from attending many formal schools, initial skill training programs are being developed to train prior-service Reservists in selected occupational specialties using combinations of two-week formal schools, on-the-job training, distance learning, correspondence courses, mobile training teams and civilian vocational technical courses.

Specialized Skill Training is the most diverse of the major categories of individual training. In the interest of clarity, the full category has been divided into five sub-categories. Two are concerned with initial skill training, one for officers, the other for enlisted personnel. Two others cover more advanced training, again divided by officer and enlisted. The last category covers both officer and enlisted training that conveys required knowledge or skills without changing the student's primary skill or skill level.

INITIAL SKILL TRAINING (ENLISTED)

Initial Skill Training (Enlisted) includes all formal training normally given immediately after Recruit Training and leading toward the award of a military occupational specialty or rating at the lowest skill level. Successful completion of the training qualifies the enlisted member to take a position in the job structure of the Service and to progress to the journeyman level through job experience. Army One-Station Unit Training which is conducted primarily for those soldiers in combat arms and some selected combat support Military Occupational Specialties (MOSs) satisfies this same purpose but, because it combines skill training with recruit training in a single course, it is treated separately in this report.

The great majority of Service recruits are drawn from the least skilled segment of the population. Most recruits are under age 2l and have little civilian job experience. In addition, some civilian specialties are not in demand in the military job structure, and many of the most important military skills have no civilian counterpart. Consequently, only a small number of people enter the Service with a skill that can be used with little or no additional training. Enlistees must be trained in a technical skill before they can become productive. Some skills can be acquired through experience and on-the-job training. The vast majority, however, are most effectively and efficiently learned through formal courses. In some situations -- for example, on board ship or in remote locations -- the opportunity for on-the-job training is limited.

Load data for Initial Skill Training (Enlisted) is displayed in Table V-2. The classification of this training is determined by its purpose, rather than by whether entrants attend

immediately after Recruit Training. Thus, some prior-service students and cross-trainees from other skill areas are reflected in this data.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE V-2. Training Input, Output, and Load

Initial Skill Training (Enlisted)

Service Component	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	10,773	11,786	47,255	44,992	11,959	47,798	45,425	12,450
Reserve	2,372	3,267	16,567	16,895	3,415	18,872	18,277	3,892
National Gd	2,686	3,251	20,788	19,694	4,162	16,303	17,199	3,490
Navy								
Active	11,124	11,607	124,019	119,530	11,023	128,391	123,678	11,508
Reserve	177	190	1,683	1,567	176	1,730	1,605	177
Marine Corps								
Active	6,602	6,702	61,543	58,141	7,241	63,606	60,131	7,427
Reserve	927	1,335	12,305	11,659	1,274	12,720	12,061	1,313
Air Force								
Active	8,016	9,796	47,206	48,915	11,249	47,206	48,915	11,249
Reserve	445	815	4,188	4,567	1,020	4,188	4,567	1,020
National Gd	1,328	1,880	10,785	11,624	2,620	10,785	11,624	2,620
DoD								
Active	36,515	39,891	280,023	271,578	41,472	287,001	278,149	42,634
Rsv/Gd Total	7,935	10,738	66,316	66,006	12,667	64,598	65,333	12,512
TOTAL	**44,450**	**50,629**	**346,339**	**337,584**	**54,139**	**351,599**	**343,482**	**55,146**

♦ ♦ ♦

New mission requirements and technological change have resulted in consolidating or splitting skill areas and extensive modification of existing training programs. For instance, the introduction of word processors and microcomputers into Air Force personnel, administration and resource management offices has increased the percentage of new accessions requiring formal training for these skills.

Reserve trainees graduating from Recruit Training proceed to Initial Skill Training in their occupational specialty. This may consist of a course in a Service school or Advanced Individual Training at an Army training center. The actual length of active duty training, in comparison with the statutory twelve weeks minimum, varies from twelve weeks to twelve months, depending on the occupational specialties involved. To

accommodate the Reserve Component member, a split-training program allows completion of initial entry training in two training segments in a two-year period.

The variety of skills required in the four Services dictates a large number of courses for enlisted personnel in Initial Skill Training, as shown in the following table.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE V-3. Number of Courses

Initial Skill Training (Enlisted)

Fiscal Year	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
FY 02	225	143	198	212

♦ ♦ ♦

Course lengths vary widely based on the complexity of the subject matter. For example, an Air Force course for cytotechnology specialists is 52 weeks long; but a course for aerospace maintenance is only 1.4 weeks long. Table V-4 shows the average course lengths for the Services' Enlisted Initial Skill Training.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE V-4. Average Course Length

Initial Skill Training (Enlisted)

(Academic Days in Training)

Fiscal Year	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
FY 02	59	33	81	55

♦ ♦ ♦

Initial Skill courses includes general skills, intelligence, cryptography and health service training. Some of these courses (for example, nuclear reactor specialist or electronics technician) are highly technical. Others involve less complex skills – cook, clerk-typist, and vehicle driver. A sampling of high-volume courses is shown in Table V-5.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE V-5. Initial Skill Training Courses with High Student Flow

FY 02	Student Input	Course Length (weeks)
Army		
Medical Specialist	6,100	10.0
Unit Supply Specialist	4,473	7.3
Motor Transport Operator	4,237	6.0
Automated Logistical Specialist	3,979	12.0
Food Service Specialist	3,643	8.2
Light Wheel Vehicle Mechanic	3,242	10.0
Administrative Specialist	3,077	5.0
Petroleum Supply Specialist	2,719	8.4
Signal Support Systems Specialist	2,284	19.4
Multichannel Transmission Sys Op/Maint	1,640	13.3
Navy		
Apprentice Training	10,166	2.0
Hospital Corpsman Basic	4,500	14.0
Avionics Common Core Class A1	4,425	7.3
Engineering Common Core	4,384	2.7
Advanced Electronics Technical Core	3,728	15.4
Basic Enlisted Submarine	2,379	4.4
Engineering Mechanical Core	1,926	3.4
Aviation Ordananceman Class A1	1,684	4.6
Avionics Technician I Level Class A1	1,676	14.7
Engineering Electrical Core	1,588	11.3
Marine Corps		
Marine Combat Training (MCT)	24,641	4.2
Rifleman	6,526	10.6
Motor Transport Operator (USMC)	2,031	8.4
Field Radio Operator (FROC)	1,270	9.8
Avionics Common Core Class A1	1,023	9.8
Automotive Organizational Maintenance	1,022	16.6
Basic Electronics Course (BEC)	1,004	13.4
Entry Level Small Computer Systems Specialist	907	11.2
Mortarman Course	800	10.6
Machine Gunner	776	10.6

TABLE V-5. Initial Skill Training Courses... (Cont...)

FY 02	Student Input	Course Length (weeks)
Air Force		
Security Forces Apprentice	3,969	10.8
Security Forces Apprentice (Navy)	1,909	5.4
Comm-Computer System Operations Apprentice	1,812	12.6
Munitions Systems Apprentice	1,354	8.8
Information Management Apprentice	1,341	7.4
Supply Management Apprentice	1,235	6.8
Navy/AF Consolidated Food	1,152	6.2
Fighter Aircraft Maintenance Apprentice (F-16)	1,069	18.8
Fighter Aircraft Maintenance Apprentice	1,032	4.0
Air Transportation Apprentice	987	5.8

♦ ♦ ♦

The final determinant of training loads is the anticipated rate of attrition. Attrition rates must be estimated for each course. A routine course may have low attrition while attrition may run high in complex technical courses. Unlike Recruit Training, students who fail Initial Skill Training usually are not discharged but re-trained in other, less difficult skills. The Services have implemented numerous initiatives to manage attrition; the average anticipated attrition rates are shown below.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE V-6. Average Attrition Rates

Initial Skill Training (Enlisted)

Fiscal Year	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
FY 02	2.6%	5.0%	1.3%	3.1%
FY 03	2.6%	4.0%	1.3%	3.1%

♦ ♦ ♦

SKILL PROGRESSION TRAINING (ENLISTED)

This sub-category covers skill training received by enlisted personnel after Initial Skill Training. Through this training the student gains the knowledge to perform at higher skill levels or in a supervisory position. Skill Progression Training is most frequently given after Service members have gained experience through actual work in their

specialty. In some cases, however, training in a relatively narrow subject area as an immediate follow-on to Initial Skill Training is included in Skill Progression Training. Training load data for Skill Progression Training (Enlisted) is shown in Table V-7.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE V-7. Training Input, Output, and Load

Skill Progression Training (Enlisted)

Service Component	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	5,553	6,045	64,304	61,796	6,183	60,977	58,333	5,804
Reserve	347	343	3,988	4,005	447	2,839	2,616	400
National Gd	225	207	2,706	2,697	229	1,993	1,939	198
Navy								
Active	7,256	7,660	64,986	62,740	8,049	65,612	63,347	8,131
Reserve	117	115	1,651	1,609	131	1,666	1,624	132
Marine Corps								
Active	1,957	2,178	18,677	18,547	2,393	18,126	17,998	2,266
Reserve	115	205	2,039	2,025	144	1,928	1,919	136
Air Force								
Active	1,897	3,618	37,150	37,111	2,805	37,150	37,111	2,805
Reserve	145	245	4,503	4,492	338	4,503	4,492	338
National Gd	369	396	7,246	7,166	543	7,246	7,166	543
DoD								
Active	16,663	19,501	185,117	180,194	19,430	181,865	176,789	19,006
Rsv/Gd Total	1,318	1,511	22,133	21,994	1,832	20,175	19,756	1,747
TOTAL	**17,981**	**21,012**	**207,250**	**202,188**	**21,262**	**202,040**	**196,545**	**20,753**

♦ ♦ ♦

The requirement for Skill Progression Training arises from the fact that training in a skill at entry level and subsequent experience do not, in many cases, fully qualify service members to do the more advanced jobs in their field. Several factors may contribute, individually or in combination, to a need for additional formal training:

- The introduction of new equipment.
- The need to produce a higher degree of skill in a sub-specialty.
- The need to impart a broader base of knowledge to qualify an individual for supervisory responsibility.

- The requirement for refresher training to bring the Service member up to date on the latest information and techniques in a skill.

As in all other types of training, the primary need is to have trained individuals available to replace losses as they occur. Planning future training in this sub-category follows the same general pattern as for Initial Skill Training. Some additional complications, however, are introduced by the fact that members eligible for schooling are frequently serving overseas or on board ship, rather than flowing from the Recruit Training pipeline. This situation requires scheduling personnel to receive institutional training when they are available, preferably between duty assignments. Reserve Component personnel have similar difficulties attending formal schools because of civilian employer commitments. Service implementation of distance learning has helped to provide alternative delivery of skill progression training from traditional resident settings.

The following table displays course data for Skill Progression Training for each of the Services.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE V-8. Courses, Course Length, and Projected Attrition

Skill Progression Training (Enlisted)

Course Information	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
FY 02 Number of Courses	457	1,462	464	562
Average Course Length (Academic Days)	26	42	54	16
Projected Attrition	3.9%	3.0%	0.4%	1.0%

♦ ♦ ♦

The Air Force's average days in training are low compared to the other Services because of the heavy use of short courses. The large number of Navy courses is a reflection of the many Navy occupational subspecialties.

INITIAL SKILL TRAINING (OFFICER)

As a general rule, Officer Acquisition Training is oriented toward the broad educational background and general military training that is considered necessary for all officers entering a Service. Most newly commissioned officers require further training for the specific type of duty they will be performing in their first duty assignment. Initial Skill Training for officers is, therefore, analogous to Initial Skill Training for enlisted

personnel. Both provide the job-oriented training which, added to military fundamentals learned earlier, prepares the individual for taking a place in the job structure.

Load data for Initial Skill Training (Officer) is displayed in Table V-9.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE V-9. Training Input, Output, and Load

Initial Skill Training (Officer)

Service Component	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	1,792	1,856	6,881	6,938	2,000	6,939	6,785	1,892
Reserve	218	247	1,975	1,905	287	2,026	2,000	302
National Gd	348	417	1,275	1,197	353	1,187	1,160	302
Navy								
Active	494	412	2,256	2,231	390	2,325	2,299	397
Reserve	2	0	41	41	0	42	42	0
Marine Corps								
Active	378	1,101	3,170	3,134	1,045	3,261	3,226	1,081
Reserve	2	6	181	181	11	168	168	9
Air Force								
Active	612	670	3,724	3,720	926	3,724	3,720	926
Reserve	20	29	233	250	60	233	250	60
National Gd	75	90	517	540	131	517	540	131
DoD								
Active	3,276	4,039	16,031	16,023	4,361	16,249	16,030	4,296
Rsv/Gd Total	665	789	4,222	4,114	842	4,173	4,160	804
TOTAL	**3,941**	**4,828**	**20,253**	**20,137**	**5,203**	**20,422**	**20,190**	**5,100**

♦ ♦ ♦

With minor exceptions, all newly commissioned Army officers attend officer basic courses at their branch schools -- Infantry officers at the Infantry School, Engineer officers at the Engineer School, and so forth. The Army conducts 63 initial officer basic courses with an average course length of 14 weeks. Officers attend before reporting to their initial assignment. In addition, certain officers are selected to attend one of 36 follow-on skill or functional training courses for more specialized assignments.

All submarine and nuclear officers and most Surface Navy officers go to Initial Skill Training. The Navy provides 20 courses for officers in Initial Skill Training, with an average course length of 24.2 weeks.

All newly commissioned Marine Corps officers attend a basic course for general orientation and training. In addition, most Marine Corps officers attend one of the 75 Initial Skill Training courses sponsored by the Corps. They may also participate in courses conducted by the Navy or other Services. Such courses average 18 weeks in length and are related to specific officer positions.

Initial Skill Training (Officer) has a significant increase in the load because last year the Basic School for officers with a load of 642, was not reported in this category. By more appropriately categorizing the Basic School, the Marine Corps is now more in line with the intent of this report.

The Air Force conducts 37 Initial Skill Training courses for officers (which do not include Flight Training courses), with an average length of 15 weeks. The Air Force sends newly commissioned officers to initial skills courses within six months of their commissioning.

SKILL PROGRESSION TRAINING (OFFICER)

Skill Progression Training for officers is, in general, aimed at officers with several years of practical experience and provides them knowledge needed to assume more advanced responsibilities. For example, the Army provides advanced courses that are structured to prepare the students for battalion and brigade staff duties in addition to command responsibilities at the company and battery level. Data for Skill Progression Training (Officer) is displayed in the following table.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE V-10. Training Input, Output, and Load

Skill Progression Training (Officer)

Service Component	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	1,978	2,242	11,997	11,808	2,304	11,490	11,729	2,174
Reserve	125	247	2,498	2,597	227	2,300	2,237	160
National Gd	156	210	2,895	2,722	469	3,229	3,221	599
Navy								
Active	808	805	7,441	7,337	853	7,510	7,404	858
Reserve	1	5	69	69	5	70	70	5
Marine Corps								
Active	108	212	2,811	2,809	140	2,624	2,623	135
Reserve	4	33	344	344	3	411	411	8

TABLE V-10. Training Input, Output, and Load (Cont...)

Skill Progression Training (Officer)

Service Component	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Air Force								
Active	187	133	3,161	3,160	149	3,161	3,160	149
Reserve	12	4	150	150	7	150	150	7
National Gd	23	7	248	248	12	248	248	12
DoD								
Active	3,081	3,392	25,410	25,114	3,446	24,785	24,916	3,316
Rsv/Gd Total	321	506	6,204	6,130	723	6,408	6,337	791
TOTAL	**3,402**	**3,898**	**31,614**	**31,244**	**4,169**	**31,193**	**31,253**	**4,107**

♦ ♦ ♦

The Army conducts 218 courses averaging 39 days in length. The Navy maintains 129 courses averaging 45 days in length. Navy courses cover a variety of specialized duties that are typically performed by officers with several years of service; for example, the aviation maintenance officer course and the nuclear propulsion plant course.

Both the Marine Corps and the Air Force conduct broad courses for officers at about the same level as the Army's advanced courses; however, as these are Service-wide and uniform in content, they are carried in Professional Development Education in this report. Within Skill Progression Training, Marine Corps officers attend 234 courses, averaging 30 days in length. They also utilize the course offerings of the other Services. The Air Force has 347 courses, averaging 12 academic days each, which train officers in new duties required by their prospective assignments.

Attrition from the Skill Progression courses for officers is significantly lower than for enlisted or initial skill officer training. Attrition of less than one percent is typical of such courses.

The Air National Guard (ANG) also conducts specialized skill progression training in several aviation disciplines at ANG installations. Air Force facilities cannot be used for this training due to constrained training time available for the reservist, geographic dispersion of units, availability of training equipment and location of training areas.

FUNCTIONAL TRAINING (OFFICER AND ENLISTED)

Functional Training is an "all other" sub-category covering those types of required training that does not fit neatly into the definitions of the other sub-categories. Functional Training may also be described as training for a specific assignment or duty

position. On the whole, Functional Training is in subject areas that cut across the scope of military occupational specialties and provides additional required skills without changing the student's primary specialty or skill level. For example, in the Air Force only survival training is considered functional training. Both officers and enlisted personnel participate in Functional Training. Load data for Functional Training is shown in Table V-11.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE V-11. Training Input, Output, and Load

Functional Training (Officer and Enlisted)

Service Component	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	4,963	5,283	68,178	61,452	6,171	67,585	61,604	6,213
Reserve	274	294	6,036	6,005	380	7,105	6,989	441
National Gd	247	271	5,149	4,773	381	5,523	5,248	453
Navy								
Active	4,977	5,621	319,147	312,139	5,753	321,837	314,791	5,798
Reserve	81	97	5,317	5,166	97	5,354	5,202	98
Marine Corps								
Active	531	699	13,756	13,564	791	13,441	13,249	684
Reserve	7	73	1,557	1,542	33	1,757	1,745	42
Air Force								
Active	202	195	8,476	8,394	272	8,476	8,394	272
Reserve	10	8	616	608	18	616	608	18
National Gd	14	22	558	549	17	558	549	17
DoD								
Active	10,673	11,798	409,557	395,549	12,987	411,339	398,038	12,967
Rsv/Gd Total	633	765	19,233	18,643	926	20,913	20,341	1,069
TOTAL	**11,306**	**12,563**	**428,790**	**414,192**	**13,913**	**432,252**	**418,379**	**14,036**

♦ ♦ ♦

Army Functional Training includes the airborne, ranger, and special forces qualification courses, many specialized NCO supervision courses, language training, and a number of courses related to specialized equipment, e.g., Satellite Communication Operation and Maintenance. The number of functional courses conducted at Training Major Army Commands (MACOMs) has declined as a result of course consolidations and elimination.

Navy Functional Training differs from that of the other Services because of the very high input to a large number of very short courses. Most of the training is conducted while the ship is in port and includes the following types of activity:

- Shore training for shipboard teams (firefighting, damage control, anti-submarine warfare, and so forth).
- Short basic or refresher courses at fleet training centers in the operation of equipment or systems (TOMAHAWK operations and maintenance, SH-60B system familiarization, and 50 cal. machine gun operations).
- Shipboard in-port training assistance (combat systems, advanced acoustic analysis and command excellence seminar mobile training teams).
- Pre-commissioning training for newly formed crews of ships under construction (damage control, Combat Information Center team training and radar navigation team training).

Marine Corps functional training provides skills necessary to perform a specific mission outside of the normal primary occupational specialty. Examples of functional training courses taught at Marine institutions are Marine Corps Security Guard, Scout-Sniper, Range Officer, Drill Instructor, and Cold Weather Survival.

Most Air Force Functional Training is survival training related to various environments: water, arctic, jungle, or tropic. These courses train air crews skills needed for long-term combat survival and survival in chemically, biologically, and radiological contaminated environments.

The following table provides course data for Functional Training.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE V-12. Courses, Course Length and Functional Training

Course Information	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
FY 02 Number of Courses	1,152	1,777	115	7
Average Course Length (Training Days)	21	8	20	9
FY 03 Number of Courses	1,239	1,754	115	7
Average Course Length	21	8	20	9

♦ ♦ ♦

CHAPTER VI: FLIGHT TRAINING

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Flight Training programs provide basic flying skills required prior to operational assignment of pilots, navigators, and naval flight officers. Most of the training in this category is undergraduate flight training. At the conclusion of this training, a graduate is awarded "wings" and is classified as a "designated" or "rated" officer. Flight Training includes programs for pilots of all Services, navigators in the Air Force, and naval flight officers in the Navy and Marine Corps. Pilot training may be in jet or propeller-driven fixed-wing aircraft, or in helicopters. Some related advanced flight training, such as Army instructor pilot training, is also included in Flight Training. Enlisted programs in aviation related subjects (for example, in air traffic control) and Air Force survival training are in Specialized Skill Training. Marine Corps enlisted navigator training is included in Flight Training.

Flight Training loads, by Service and component are shown in Table VI-1

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VI-1. Total Flight Training Load

Service Component	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
Army							
Active	657	696	730	723	740	909	905
Reserve	12	17	14	9	10	33	30
National Guard	134	148	180	180	198	271	370
Navy							
Active	1,324	1,648	1,592	1,513	1,577	1,455	1,519
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marine Corps							
Active	471	608	523	499	585	507	527
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Air Force							
Active	1,190	1,329	1,636	1,657	1,635	1,832	1,749
Reserve	47	64	89	89	79	135	136
National Guard	139	129	156	201	194	220	221
Total							
Active	3,642	4,281	4,481	4,392	4,537	4,703	4,700
Reserve/Guard	332	358	439	479	481	659	757
TOTAL	**3,974**	**4,639**	**4,920**	**4,871**	**5,018**	**5,362**	**5,457**

♦ ♦ ♦

For purposes of clarity, the following discussion of aviation training is divided into three sections: Undergraduate Pilot Training, Navigator Training and All Other Flight Training.

UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING

Undergraduate Pilot Training qualifies students to perform the flight duties and to assume the responsibilities of military pilots. Air Force courses include sufficient flying training to allow the student to attain proficiency in the general class of aircraft flown in future assignments. Flight-related ground training and simulator training augment flying training. The Army uses a large number of warrant officer pilots. Enlisted entrants attend Warrant Officer Candidate School and upon graduation receive a conditional warrant appointment to warrant. Conditional warrants convert to Warrant Officer upon successful completion of flight training. Some Army flight training students are already commissioned officers or warrant officers prior to entering flight training.

Training load data for undergraduate pilot training are displayed in Table VI-2.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VI-2. Training Input, Output, and Load

Undergraduate Pilot Training

Service Component	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	493	496	2,690	2,608	617	2,728	2,628	621
Reserve	2	3	85	78	17	51	62	13
National Gd	111	115	657	659	154	741	688	167
Navy								
Active	1,130	1,160	747	568	960	825	584	1,015
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marine Corps								
Active	445	537	359	293	444	375	294	463
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Air Force								
Active	1,170	1,154	2,547	2,200	1,275	2,374	2,096	1,211
Reserve	63	67	193	176	95	192	185	97
National Gd	164	166	358	315	186	361	319	187
DoD								
Active	3,238	3,347	6,343	5,669	3,296	6,302	5,602	3,310
Rsv/Gd Total	340	351	1,293	1,228	452	1,345	1,254	464
TOTAL	**3,578**	**3,698**	**7,636**	**6,897**	**3,748**	**7,647**	**6,856**	**3,774**

♦ ♦ ♦

Load data for each Service for undergraduate helicopter pilot training are shown in Table VI-3.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VI-3. Training Input, Output, and Load

Undergraduate Helicopter Training

Service Component	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	493	496	2,690	2,608	617	2,728	2,628	621
Reserve	2	3	85	78	17	51	62	13
National Gd	111	115	657	659	154	741	688	167
Navy								
Active	440	410	296	225	337	336	229	361
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marine Corps								
Active	228	244	200	175	224	213	171	230
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Air Force								
Active	17	20	55	50	24	59	54	26
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
National Gd	1	2	4	5	2	4	4	2
DoD								
Active	1,178	1,170	3,241	3,058	1,202	3,336	3,082	1,238
Rsv/Gd Total	114	120	746	742	173	796	754	182
TOTAL	**1,292**	**1,290**	**3,987**	**3,800**	**1,375**	**4,132**	**3,836**	**1,420**

NOTE: USAF Air Education and Training Command has transitioned the majority of UPT training and all of helicopter training to Specialized Undergraduate Pilot Training (SUPT).

♦ ♦ ♦

Table VI-4 shows FY 2002 programmed course length and projected attrition rates for the Army undergraduate helicopter pilot training program.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VI-4. FY02 Course Length and Attrition Rates, Army

Undergraduate Helicopter Pilot Training*

Length / Rate	Commissioned Officer Candidates	Warrant Officer Candidates
Course Length (Weeks)	40	40
Attrition Rate	0.9%	14.0%

** UHPT consists of dual track training in either the UH-1H or the OH-58 A/C*

♦ ♦ ♦

Navy Undergraduate Pilot Training begins with a common core of basic ground training and primary flight training and then diverges according to whether the student is to be qualified in jet aircraft, propeller aircraft or helicopters. The basic ground phase, or aviation pre-flight indoctrination, is six weeks in length for officer students.

Table VI-5 shows FY 2002 course length in weeks, attrition rates, and type of aircraft used for training for each phase of the syllabus.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VI-5. Course Phasing, Navy/Marine Corps

Undergraduate Pilot Training

Course / Phase	Course Length (weeks)	Attrition Rate		Type Aircraft
		Navy	USMC	
Commisioned Officer				
Aviation Pre-Flight Indoctrination	6.0	3.0%	1.0%	None
Primary Flight Training				
(Jet, Prop, Helo)	23.4	9.7%	9.4%	T-34C
Strike Training (Jet)				
Intermediate	22.8	5.5%	5.5%	T-2C
T45 Advanced	34.6	10.0%	10.0%	T45A
T 45TS Advanced	44.6	8.0%	8.0%	T45A
Maritime Training (Prop)				
Intermediate	5.2	1.0%	1.0%	T-34C
Advanced	20.2	2.0%	2.0%	T-44A
USAF Adv Multi-Engine	25.0	N/A	N/A	T-44A
E-2/C-2 Training (Carrier Based Multi-Engine)				
Intermediate	14.6	2.0%	N/A	T-44A
Advanced	22.6	9.0%	N/A	T-2C

TABLE VI-5. Course Phasing, Navy/Marine Corps (Cont...)

Undergraduate Pilot Training

Course / Phase	Course Length (weeks)	Attrition Rate		Type Aircraft
		Navy	USMC	
Rotary Helicopter Training				
Intermediate	5.2	1.0%	1.0%	T-34C
Advanced	21.4	3.3%	3.5%	TH-57

♦ ♦ ♦

Due to the task requirements which dictate variations in course content, the standard Undergraduate Pilot Training course is as short as 50 weeks for an officer student qualifying in helicopters or as long as 91 weeks for a student Naval Aviator qualifying in Advanced Strike Fighter. Actual course duration may be longer because of unforeseen circumstances such as major aircraft groundings, fuel shortages or inclement weather.

Table VI-6 displays load data for Navy and Marine Corps Undergraduate Pilot Training. All participants are in the active force.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VI-6. Training Input, Output, and Load

Navy/Marine Corps Undergraduate Jet Pilot Training

Service	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Navy								
Jet	474	457	229	160	346	246	161	355
Prop	216	293	222	183	277	243	194	299
Helo	440	410	296	225	337	336	229	361
Total	**1,130**	**1,160**	**747**	**568**	**960**	**825**	**584**	**1,015**
Marine Corps								
Jet	183	254	127	94	185	130	95	195
Prop	34	39	32	24	35	32	28	38
Helo	228	244	200	175	224	213	171	230
Total	**445**	**537**	**359**	**293**	**444**	**375**	**294**	**463**

♦ ♦ ♦

Air Force helicopter pilots begin in Primary (T-37: 26 weeks or T-34: 30 weeks), then continue on to the Army UH-1 (26 weeks). Forecast attrition (all phases) is 12.9%, not including screening programs.

In addition, approximately 203 Air Force pilots will be trained annually in the EURO-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training (ENJJPT) program at Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas. Forecast attrition for the program is 12.4 percent and the course length is 56 weeks. ENJJPT is a cooperative undergraduate pilot and pilot instructor training program that began operation on 1 October 1981 and is scheduled to end in 2005. Nations involved in the program are Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. ENJJPT is based on the principles of proportionate sharing of program costs and proportionate instructor pilot manning. Alternative scenarios to succeed ENJJPT are being reviewed for future NATO Flight Training which include flexible syllabi, upgraded and/or new trainer aircraft, increased simulation, and concurrent programs in the U.S. and Canada. Joint Primary Aircraft Training System (JPATS) is starting up at Moody Air Force Base in FY 2002 using the new T-6 aircraft.

Load data for both standard Air Force pilot training and ENJJPT are shown in Table VI-7.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VI-7. Training Input, Output, and Load

Air Force Undergraduate Jet Pilot Training

Service	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Active	1,040	1,009	2,087	1,768	1,064	1,904	1,654	996
Reserve	56	59	154	139	77	151	146	78
National Guard	153	152	322	282	167	325	287	168
TOTAL	**1,249**	**1,220**	**2,563**	**2,189**	**1,308**	**2,380**	**2,087**	**1,242**

♦ ♦ ♦

At the conclusion of Undergraduate Pilot Training, the new pilot is qualified in trainer aircraft but requires additional training in operational aircraft units and employment tactics.

SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING (SUPT)

USAF Air Education and Training Command has fully transitioned from generalized Undergraduate Pilot Training (UPT) to Specialized Undergraduate Pilot Training (SUPT). Students now begin in the T-37 (Columbus, Laughlin, or Vance) or the Navy T-34 (Whiting NAS), and then split into specialized tracks. Fighter-bound students fly the T-38 track in Phase III. Students in the Airlift-Tanker-Bomber track fly the T-1A.

Students selected for Multi-engine turboprop train in the Navy T-44. Finally, students going to helicopters continue on to the Army UH-1.

UNDERGRADUATE NAVIGATOR TRAINING

The Navy trains Navy and Marine Corps personnel to become Naval Flight Officers. The Air Force trains its personnel as navigators. The duties of Naval Flight Officers and Air Force navigators are not precisely the same because of mission differences, but at the undergraduate level they are sufficiently similar that they are referred to collectively in this report as "Navigators" (the Army does not train or use Navigators).

The Undergraduate Naval Flight Officer (UNFO) training program is a building block training program. Training commences at NAS Pensacola with Aviation Pre-flight Indoctrination (six weeks) during which the student learns the aeronautical and physiological aspects of flight. After completing this phase of the training, the student enters Basic Naval Flight Officer (NFO) training also located at NAS Pensacola. This 14-week course encompasses basic Navigation/Communications training developed in the 1D-23 Computerized NAV/COM training device and 2B37 (T-34C) Simulator. During this phase of training the NFO is taught basic flight skills and knowledge needed to safely navigate, communicate and manage the (T-34C) aircraft systems. Successful completion of Basic NFO training qualifies student for entrance into either the Joint Undergraduate Navigation Training (JUNT) (22 weeks) conducted at Randolph AFB, Texas (described in a later paragraph), or the Navy Intermediate NFO training held at NAS Pensacola. The Intermediate NFO Phase of training (14 weeks) is divided into two levels of training both of which expand the knowledge gained in Basic NFO phase training and requires higher skill and performance standards. The student receives additional 1D-23 NAV/COM, 2B37 (T-34D) Simulator, and T-34C flight training in the first level of Intermediate training. In the second level of training the student advances to the multi place (T-1A Jayhawk) aircraft for jet instrument and visual navigation. After successful attainment of the performance standards, the student proceeds to one of the following advanced specialized Naval Flight Officer Training phases: Strike Fighter (F-14D/F-18E/F) (28 weeks), Strike (ES-3/S-3B/EA-6B) (21 Weeks), or Airborne Tactical Data Systems (E-2C) (15 weeks of training held at VAW-110 NAS, Norfolk). Students who advance to Strike/Strike Fighter training receive Ground Mapping & Air Intercept simulator training respectively. Both receive advanced flight training in the (T-39N Sabreliner) multi-place aircraft where they perfect the necessary radar skills required by fleet NFOs. Additionally, the students train in the 2F101 T-2 Simulator and T-2C aircraft for jet acclimatization and high speed navigation.

The advanced segment of training for Naval Flight Officers destined for the multi-engine land base community (EP-3/P-3/E-6A) is now managed by the 562 FTS at Randolph AFB. Navigator candidates receive 333 hours of academic instruction, 84 hours of simulator training, and 73 hours of flight instruction in the T-43 aircraft during 22 weeks

of training. This training provides sufficient skills and knowledge so that further training for the newly rated navigator can be limited to flight training in operational aircraft and training in employment of applicable weapons systems.

The new Joint Specialized Undergraduate Navigator Training (JSUNT) program began in Apr 1999. Under JSUNT, either the Air Force or the Navy, depending on the track they select trains Navigators. NAS Pensacola will train Bomber/Fighter Navigators, while Randolph AFB will train both Panel Navigators (C-130/C-141/C-5/C-135) and Electronic Warfare Officers (EWO) for all required weapon systems. This training function was formerly provided at NAS Corry Station. The new JSUNT will train students from USAF, USN, ANG, AFRC, and foreign countries. Air Force Navigator training starts with CORE, which qualifies students to perform basic navigational skills and prepares them for specialized training. Additionally, this course will strengthen the student's leadership skills, officer qualities and supervisory abilities. Upon completion of CORE, the students are tracked into either the Panel Navigator qualification or the Electronic Warfare Officer (EWO) qualification. The Panel Navigator students enter the Airlift/Tanker/Maritime (ATM) course. Here the focus is to qualify navy officers as Naval Flight Officers (NFOs) ready to enter initial operational aircrew upgrade training, and to qualify non-rated USAF officers to perform intermediate navigational duties and prepare them for further specialized training. ATM also stresses leadership skills, officer qualities, and supervisory abilities. After ATM, panel navigator students continue to Electronic Warfare (EW) Principles, where the fundamental issues concerning electronic warfare are taught. Panel Navigator students proceed to Theater Operations, where they learn low-level navigation duties and concepts of geographic theaters as supporters of regional airlift requirements. Finally, Panel Navigator students attend T-1A Airmanship, where either low level procedures, low level airdrop, or air refueling procedures are taught depending on the student's aircraft assignment. The EWO students will track into the EWO course upon completion of CORE. This course is an extensive field of study into state-of-the-art models of the wartime electromagnetic capabilities and applications scenarios. Upon completion of EWO, these students enter Theater Operations and complete the same training as their Panel Navigator counterparts. The total training time for panel navigators and EWOs is 170-180 training days. Other navigators, trained at NAS Pensacola, attend some forms of JSUNT training at Randolph. B-1 Weapon System Officers (WSOs) are trained at Pensacola and receive their EWO training at Randolph. Field-experienced F15 WSOs from ACC attend the EWO training to qualify as F15 EWOs. JSUNT graduates receive their assignments via a merit order assignment process.

Training load data for Undergraduate Navigator Training are displayed in Table VI-8.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VI-8. Training Input, Output, and Load

Undergraduate Navigator Training

Service/ Component	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Navy								
Active	334	390	346	285	379	432	230	388
Marine Corps								
Active	54	48	53	38	63	59	34	64
Air Force								
Active	326	281	1,684	1,591	329	1,642	1,559	323
Reserve	2	0	64	65	10	66	66	10
National Guard	21	16	102	101	16	100	99	16
DoD								
Active	714	719	2,083	1,914	771	2,133	1,823	775
Rsv/Guard	23	16	166	166	26	166	165	26
TOTAL	**737**	**735**	**2,249**	**2,080**	**797**	**2,299**	**1,988**	**801**

♦ ♦ ♦

OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING

This category covers miscellaneous types of flight training, including flight familiarization and other flight programs, which were not previously included in undergraduate pilot or navigator training. Load data are displayed in Table VI-9.

The Army includes courses for instructor pilots and specific aircraft pilot qualification courses in this category. Most of the courses are short, in the range of two to seven weeks.

The Navy Other Flight Training workload is composed mainly of instructor ground school training courses. Prospective instructors are taught unique techniques employed in the training of flight students. These courses are the Flight Instructor Training Course (FITC) and the Academic Instructor Training School (AITS). Jet transition training for designated aviators not qualified in jet aircraft is also included in this category, as are indoctrination flights for U. S. Naval Academy and NROTC midshipmen. The USNA did not participate in the flight phase of summer training at Pensacola in FY 2001. Participation is expected to return in FY 2002. For this report, the Navy included Midshipmen T-34C, Midshipmen TH-57, and Aircrew Coordination Training Instructors in Table VI-9.

The Air Force screens its pilot candidates in a 5-week Enhanced Flight Screening (EFS) program. The T-3 Firefly was the aircraft used for this program, however, it was grounded in July 1997, and placed on "minimum maintenance" status in August 1998. In December 1998, AETC implemented a new program to accomplish similar goals. Pilot candidates are now offered "Introduction to Flight Training" (IFT). IFT is a 40 hour FAA FAR Part 61 or Part 141 program (minimum 1 hour solo) flown with local civilian flight schools, aero clubs, or Fixed Based Operators (FBOs). Pilot candidates must now either complete IFT or possess a Private Pilot License (PPL) prior to entry into Specialized Undergraduate Pilot Training (SUPT).

In FY 2002 the Navy implemented the Introductory Flight Screening (IFS) program. The IFS program is similar to the AF IFT program with 300 planned participants in FY 2002, 850 in FY 2003 and 1200 projected to enroll in FY 2004. IFS provides for 25 hours of private pilot training for prospective Navy and Marine Corps student naval aviators. Enrollees must complete training within 60 days.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VI-9. Training Input, Output, and Load

Other Flight Training

Service/ Component	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	230	244	1,796	1,882	292	1,832	1,788	284
Reserve	7	7	123	135	16	147	147	17
National Guard	69	83	786	768	117	1,334	1,255	203
Navy								
Active	49	27	2,985	2,985	116	2,985	2,985	116
Air Force								
Active	161	200	951	948	228	909	904	215
Reserve	24	12	101	111	30	105	106	29
National Guard	16	12	99	99	18	99	99	18
DoD								
Active	440	471	5,732	5,815	636	5,726	5,677	615
Rsv/Guard	116	114	1,109	1,113	181	1,685	1,607	267
TOTAL	**556**	**585**	**6,841**	**6,928**	**817**	**7,411**	**7,284**	**882**

NOTE: Other Flight Training consists of Flight Familiarization Training, Advanced Flight Training and Other Flight Training.

♦ ♦ ♦

The balance of the Air Force Other Flight Training workload is limited largely to instructor courses for pilots and navigators. Additionally, the Air Education and

Training Command conducts some specialized courses. Included among these are Fixed Wing Qualification, Banked Pilot Requalification, and Medical Officers Training.

In each of the Services, graduates of undergraduate pilot and undergraduate navigator training receive supplementary training in the specific aircraft they will be flying on operational missions. Emphasis is placed on crew training and performance under conditions that would be encountered in combat. In the Army, most of this training is provided as part of normal unit training by the operational unit to which the new pilot is assigned. In the other Services, Navy or Marine fleet readiness squadrons, Marine combat crew readiness training squadrons, and Air Force combat crew training squadrons provide this additional training. As an exception, centrally conducted Army advanced flight training loads are included within Other Flight Training loads. However, most such training is classified as "crew and unit training" by the Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force and is not included in the loads of this report.

DETERMINATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR RATED OFFICERS

Flight Training rates are developed by comparing projections of future requirements for rated officers with projections of the future status of inventories of both Reserve and Active duty rated officers. Consideration is given to the need to have sufficient active duty aviators on hand, in appropriate grades. Requirements for rated officers include both the numbers needed to man the force in peacetime and the additional increment needed to sustain the force when war breaks out. For analytical purposes, aviator requirements are divided into two parts: unit and individuals. Requirements for aviators for each of these categories are computed to meet both peacetime needs and wartime mobilization needs.

Unit requirements represent the number of rated officers needed to carry out operational, training and management activities for programmed units. Each such authorized position (that is, military space or billet) requires a rated officer as an incumbent in order to carry out the functions of the job, either because the job involves flying duties i.e., "operational flying" positions as defined for purposes of the Aviation Career Incentive Act of 1974, or requires flying experience. Other positions that may be occupied by rated officers for career broadening or similar purposes, but that do not require rated officer incumbents for accomplishing the duties, are not included. Unit requirements have three subcomponents: force, training, and supervision.

- Force requirements are the positions required to man and operate the Services' aircraft. The number of force positions is a product of established crew ratios (the number of crews per aircraft), which take into account workload (flying hour) and readiness factors and the amount of mission flying and unit flight training that is necessary.
- Training positions include the flyers that are conducting formal flight training.

- The supervision component is made up of officer positions entailing actual supervision of flying and flight-related activities and the performance of staff jobs that require the expertise of a rated officer. These positions are continuously scrutinized by the services to assure that rated requirements are valid.

Individual requirements include the transients, students and other individuals needed to make it possible to provide for reasonable manning of positions in units.

Rated Officer Inventory Projections

Projecting rated officer inventories into the future must be based on historical experience, current judgment and an appraisal of how the officers will react to conditions in the future (for example: pay, morale, state of the civilian economy, civilian airline hiring plans and family satisfaction with service life). These estimates are projected for at least five years in the future. Comparisons of total force inventories of rated officers are then made against the computed total force requirements, and training rates for the entire five-year period are adjusted. This process is repeated each year so that adjustments can be made in training rates based on changes in requirements and/or updated inventory projections. This continuing process of adjustment is necessary to insure that the correct number of trained rated officers will be available in the future without large and expensive fluctuations in training rates.

Training Rate Adjustments

When a comparison of requirements and inventories discloses a shortage or overage of projected rated officers, training rates are adjusted upward or downward in order to bring the program back into balance. For example, if projected FY 2006 pilot requirements exceed projected inventories by 500, an increase in training rates (that is, output or production) of pilots of 100 per year starting in FY 2002 may be appropriate. Inputs into the training program would start in FY 2002 in order to obtain the first increase in desired output in FY 2003. This re-evaluation process is repeated at least once each year, with adjustments made as necessary to avoid wide load fluctuations.

Determination of Training Loads

The process described above, through continuous updating of the comparison between projected rated officer requirements and inventories, leads to a requirement for phased output from the flight training establishment. The desired annual output, considering the anticipated attrition rates and the planned course lengths, as discussed in the preceding sections on the various types of flight training, establishes the size of the input necessary to achieve the target output. Training loads are then calculated using these factors to determine the average number of students to be on hand during the training year. The currently recommended loads are those displayed previously in this chapter.

CHAPTER VII: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The purpose of Professional Development Education is to provide training and education to career military personnel to prepare them to perform increasingly complex responsibilities as they progress in their military careers. Where Specialized Skill Training is directed toward specific job skills, Professional Development Education is concerned with broader professional development goals in such subjects as leadership and management, military science, engineering and medicine. Professional Development Education is conducted at both military and civilian institutions. This category includes senior enlisted leadership training in recognition of the broad professional content of these courses, as opposed to the narrower skill-oriented training typical of most enlisted training programs.

Education in the military is fundamental to the development of military officers, enabling them to become fully qualified to perform duties of high responsibility in both war and peace. In most non-military professions, growth in ability and knowledge is gained through experience. In the military, opportunities for full practice of the profession are limited to wartime, and even those officers with combat experience have not had the opportunity for thorough exercise of warfare decision skills at their current rank and responsibility. The military school system serves partially to fill this shortfall by educating military officers in the skills and knowledge needed to perform their duties in a variety of locales and situations, both in peacetime and wartime.

Training loads for FY 1997 through FY 2003 are as shown in Table VII-1. The total loads in the table show a considerable disparity among the Services in amounts of Professional Development Education. These disparities are more apparent than real, and are related mainly to different ways Services categorize education and training programs that include specific branch or job-specific training content.

The first three subcategories of Professional Development Education are officer professional military development programs. These programs are at three levels: career, intermediate and senior. In addition to regular courses for Active Force officers, most schools in this category present non-resident courses and short seminars. Large numbers of Reserve Component officers and other military students are provided instruction through correspondence courses.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VII-1. Professional Development Education Training Loads

Service Component	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
Army							
Active	3,990	4,148	3,946	3,784	4,118	4,264	4,435
Reserve	59	77	82	96	97	89	95
National Guard	69	87	74	84	79	93	87
Navy							
Active	1,934	1,709	1,700	1,587	1,386	1,426	1,430
Reserve	22	23	17	23	19	16	16
Marine Corps							
Active	1,590	1,493	1,280	1,211	1,294	1,650	1,619
Reserve	64	45	13	21	26	49	37
Air Force							
Active	4,201	4,305	4,923	4,066	4,301	4,937	5,040
Reserve	195	194	207	157	120	80	80
National Guard	203	173	190	156	73	45	45
Subtotals							
Active	11,715	11,655	11,849	10,648	11,099	12,277	12,524
Reserve/Guard	612	599	583	537	414	372	360
TOTAL	**12,327**	**12,254**	**12,432**	**11,185**	**11,513**	**12,649**	**12,884**

♦ ♦ ♦

Professional Military Education (PME) is the systematic and comprehensive process of developing the skills, knowledge, and military judgment required to deal with the increasingly complex responsibilities associated with the duties and responsibilities of higher grades. In contrast to specific job or billet-related skills, PME is the life-long study of the profession of arms within the framework of military operations. PME is acquired through structured self-study, professional reading, symposia, formal schools attendance and experiences gained in duty assignments. The purpose of PME is to assist all Service members in fulfilling their personal goals and responsibilities for achieving operational competence.

CAREER OFFICER PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS

The Marine Corps and Air Force conduct career officer professional courses for officers with some experience in operational units. These courses are Service-wide in scope and are, therefore, carried in this report under Professional

Development Education. The Army and Navy conduct courses that are on a similar level, but are oriented toward specific branch or job skills, e.g., the Navy's Surface Warfare Officer's Course, or somewhat broader skills within a specific part of the Service, e.g., the Army's Armor Officer Advanced Course. The Army and Navy courses, because of their specialization, are treated in this report as part of Specialized Skill Training.

The Marine Corps Amphibious Warfare School prepares captains for duties in battalion or squadron command or on regimental level staffs. The course length is 40 weeks. The Air Force Squadron Officer School is a seven-week primary level course designed for captains to improve their professional competence and inspire their dedication to the profession of arms. The Air Force training load increased significantly from FY 2001 to FY 2002 due to new requirement for newly commissioned officers to go through the Aerospace Basic Course.

The training load data associated with these Marine and Air Force courses is displayed in Table VII-2.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VII-2. Training Input, Output, and Load

Career Officer Professional Schools

Service Component	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Marine Corps								
Active	151	133	368	368	134	368	368	134
Reserve	0	2	18	18	5	15	15	3
Air Force								
Active	488	334	7,704	7,704	611	7,704	7,704	611
Reserve	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
National Guard	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
DoD								
Active	639	467	8,072	8,072	745	8,072	8,072	745
Rsv/Guard	17	19	18	18	5	15	15	3
TOTAL	**656**	**486**	**8,090**	**8,090**	**750**	**8,087**	**8,087**	**748**

♦ ♦ ♦

INTERMEDIATE SERVICE SCHOOLS

Each of the Services maintains a Command and Staff College. While there are differences in approach and curriculum based on the requirements of the parent Service, each of the courses is designed to prepare officers for command and

staff duties in all echelons of their parent Services and in joint or allied commands. A relatively small number of officers from each Service attend one of the Command and Staff Colleges of the other Services and a few attend Allied schools at the same level. Attendance at the Intermediate Service Schools is on a select basis. The following table lists the Command and Staff Colleges and their respective course length in weeks.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VII-3. Intermediate Service Schools

Schools	Location	Course Length (weeks)
Army Command And General Staff College	Fort Leavenworth, KS	39.7
College of Naval Command and Staff	Newport, RI	37.8
Marine Corps Command and Staff College	Quantico, VA	43.6
Air Command and Staff College	Montgomery, AL	51.0
Armed Forces Staff College	Norfolk, VA	12.0

♦ ♦ ♦

Load data for military personnel attending Intermediate Service Schools is shown in the following table.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VII-4. Training Input, Output, and Load

Intermediate Service Schools

Service Component	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	714	706	865	864	705	857	864	698
Reserve	15	15	32	33	14	32	32	14
National Guard	16	16	34	34	17	34	34	16
Navy								
Active	186	180	1,012	1,008	183	1,062	1,062	195
Reserve	5	4	4	2	4	4	4	4
Marine Corps								
Active	172	114	578	578	153	578	578	153
Reserve	0	3	51	51	7	38	38	4

TABLE VII-4. Training Input, Output, and Load (Cont...)

Intermediate Service Schools

Service Component	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Air Force								
Active	476	466	697	697	453	697	697	453
Reserve	8	8	13	13	8	13	13	8
National Guard	7	8	14	14	9	14	14	9
DoD								
Active	1,548	1,466	3,152	3,147	1,494	3,194	3,201	1,499
Rsv/Guard	51	54	148	147	59	135	135	55
TOTAL	**1,599**	**1,520**	**3,300**	**3,294**	**1,553**	**3,329**	**3,336**	**1,554**

♦ ♦ ♦

SENIOR SERVICE COLLEGES

Each of the services maintains a senior officers Service School or "War College." In addition, the National Defense University, offers two joint Senior Service colleges, The National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. Students from all four Services attend these colleges. Senior Service College attendance is highly selective and students are chosen by Service selection boards from among the most promising officers in the lieutenant colonel/colonel, and commander/captain grades.

The common purpose of these Senior Service Colleges is to prepare students for senior command and staff positions at the highest levels in the national security establishment and the allied command structure. The unifying focus is the study of national goals and national security policy. Each of the Service colleges, while concentrating on the employment of the parent Service in the defense mission, also includes the study of the employment of the forces of other Services.

All of the colleges integrate the study of the economic, scientific, political, sociological and other factors into the consideration of national security issues. The Industrial College of the Armed Forces, in its approach to national security issues, emphasizes the use and management of national resources. The length of the principal courses at the Senior Service College is 10 months. Most colleges also conduct shorter special-purpose seminar-type courses, some particularly designed for Reserve Component officers. Use of these short courses is greatest in the Navy. Load data for the Senior Service Colleges is shown in the following table.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VII-5. Training Input, Output, and Load

Senior Service Colleges

Service Component	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	331	319	1,126	1,135	351	1,069	1,001	311
Reserve	49	46	239	242	47	355	354	51
National Guard	59	53	466	470	67	466	459	63
Navy								
Active	62	65	85	80	77	85	80	77
Reserve	11	9	6	5	5	6	5	5
Marine Corps								
Active	66	7	146	146	73	145	145	73
Reserve	2	1	165	165	10	104	104	3
Air Force								
Active	227	219	267	267	219	267	267	219
Reserve	9	9	12	12	10	12	12	10
National Guard	14	14	17	17	14	17	17	14
DoD								
Active	686	610	1,624	1,628	720	1,566	1,493	680
Rsv/Guard	144	132	905	911	153	960	951	146
TOTAL	**830**	**742**	**2,529**	**2,539**	**873**	**2,526**	**2,444**	**826**

♦ ♦ ♦

ENLISTED LEADERSHIP TRAINING

Courses included in this category are designed to provide selected senior enlisted personnel the skills and knowledge needed to assume the responsibilities of the highest non-commissioned officer grades. These courses are the culmination of formal enlisted training and are, for enlisted personnel, analogous to the officer courses discussed in the preceding sections. In addition to such subjects as methods of leadership, human relations, discipline and training, and the administration and employment of military organizations, these higher level schools provide senior non-commissioned officers a broader perspective of the role and functions of their Services. Schools, locations and course length in weeks are shown in Table VII-6.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VII-6. Enlisted Leadership Training Courses

Schools	Location	Course Length (weeks)
Army		
Sergeants Major Academy	Fort Bliss, TX	38
Advanced NCO (ANCOC)	TRADOC-wide	4 to 20
Basic NCO (BNCOC)	TRADOC-wide	6 to 19
Primary Leadership Dev Crs (PLDC)	Army-wide	4
Navy		
Senior Enlisted Academy	Newport,RI	9
Marine Corps		
Senior Level	Quantico, VA	1
Staff NCO Academy (Career Course)	Quantico, VA	7
	Camp Lejeune, NC	7
	Okinawa, JA	7
	Camp Pendleton, CA	7
Staff NCO Academy (Advanced Course)	Camp Pendleton, CA	8
	Camp Lejeune, NC	8
	Quantico, VA	8
	Okinawa, JA	8
Sergeant Course	Quantico, VA	5
	Camp Lejeune, NC	5
	Okinawa, JA	5
	Camp Pendleton, CA	5
	Twentynine Palms, CA	5
	Hawaii	5
Air Force		
AF Senior NCO Academy	Gunter Annex, AL	7
NCO Academies	12 Worldwide	5 to 6
AF Airman Leadership School	49 Worldwide	4 to 6

♦ ♦ ♦

Other enlisted leadership training for more junior noncommissioned officers is carried in Specialized Skill Training (except for the Air Force). This includes command sponsored NCO academies, for example. This training tends to be more skill related for specific types of specialized leadership responsibilities. The senior enlisted leadership training discussed in this chapter is more properly

thought of as Professional Development Education in a broader sense. All enlisted Air Force PME is not skill related, but focuses on leadership, followership, management and supervisory roles throughout the member's career. All four Military Services now sponsor Senior Enlisted Leadership Academies. In addition, the Air National Guard conducts Professional Military Education courses at McGhee-Tyson Air Base in Knoxville, TN. These courses include Leadership School, NCO Academy, Academy of Military Science and Professional Continuing Education. Army National Guard NCOs and Army Reserve NCOs are trained in the Reserve Component Noncommissioned Officers Education System (RCNCOES), attending courses at the appropriate level of training at Reserve Component Training Institutions. However, the training loads for Reserve Component (RC) institutions are not included within this report. Training loads for enlisted leadership training are shown in Table VII-7.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VII-7. Training Input, Output, and Load

Enlisted Leadership Training

Service Component	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	334	310	600	415	390	600	577	452
Reserve	32	36	32	41	28	45	31	30
National Guard	9	10	10	15	9	10	10	8
Navy								
Active	45	46	250	250	43	250	250	43
Reserve	4	3	20	20	4	20	20	4
Marine Corps								
Active	528	686	7,302	7,213	886	7,083	6,996	855
Reserve	19	20	725	725	27	725	725	27
Air Force								
Active	1,934	2,307	26,502	26,502	2,687	27,524	27,524	2,790
Reserve	82	26	150	150	15	150	150	15
National Guard	115	19	120	120	12	120	120	12
DoD								
Active	2,841	3,349	34,654	34,380	4,006	35,457	35,347	4,140
Rsv/Guard	261	114	1,057	1,071	95	1,070	1,056	96
TOTAL	**3,102**	**3,463**	**35,711**	**35,451**	**4,101**	**36,527**	**36,403**	**4,236**

♦ ♦ ♦

GRADUATE EDUCATION FULLY FUNDED, FULL TIME

The Department of Defense needs military officers with specialized advanced knowledge, which, in some cases, is attainable only through graduate education. Under the program established by Section 2004 of Title 10 United States Code and described in this section, military officers pursue graduate education on a fully funded, full-time basis. A minimum service payback obligation of three years for the first year of schooling and one year for each year after the first is required of all officers entering the program. Services establish maximum pay back periods.

The following table displays training load data for these graduate education programs. All participants are members of the Active Forces.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VII-8. Training Input, Output, and Load

Graduate Education, Fully Funded, Full Time

Service	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army	608	961	587	532	960	587	600	1,042
Navy	845	764	444	434	729	449	439	725
Marine Corps	207	288	170	170	309	170	170	309
Air Force	525	651	415	415	651	415	415	651
TOTAL	**2,185**	**2,664**	**1,616**	**1,551**	**2,649**	**1,621**	**1,624**	**2,727**

♦ ♦ ♦

Officer graduate students attend either a civilian educational institution or one of the two Service institutions, the Naval Postgraduate School or the Air Force Institute of Technology, depending upon where the required education can best be obtained. Curricula in the two Service institutions emphasize military unique courses, such as in logistics management or intelligence operations, and military applications in all other courses. While these schools are primarily used by the parent Services (including Marine Corps use of the Naval Postgraduate School), they also educate some students from other Services. The following table displays student loads for these two schools.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VII-9. Graduate Education Load at Service Institutions

Education Institution / Service	Actuals		Estimates	
	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
Naval Postgraduate School				
Army	112	119	126	176
Navy	687	650	615	615
Marine Corps	208	219	236	236
Air Force	31	22	20	20
Total	**1,038**	**1,010**	**997**	**1,047**
Air Force Institute of Technology				
Army	1	1	1	1
Navy	0	0	0	0
Marine Corps	8	8	8	8
Air Force	872	837	934	984
Total	**881**	**846**	**943**	**993**

♦ ♦ ♦

Requirements for graduate-degreed officers depend upon the number of "validated billets," that is; military positions that have been determined to require an incumbent with graduate level education in the applicable academic discipline. The Services examine the duty prerequisites for each billet nominated for validation and determine if the job does, in fact, require an officer with an advanced degree. Requirements for graduate legal education are determined separately.

OTHER FULL TIME EDUCATION PROGRAMS

In addition to the Professional Development Education programs already described there are a variety of other full-time programs tailored to meet the particular needs of the Services. (Health Professions Education programs are briefly discussed in a separate section at the end of this chapter).

Several programs have been designed to permit selected individuals an opportunity to work toward associate, baccalaureate or advanced degrees. These programs benefit the Services in several important ways: they increase the technical qualifications of the individuals in the program; they improve the general educational levels of Service personnel; and they provide career retention and recruiting incentives to outstanding personnel. In addition, to the

extent possible, personnel in advanced education programs are later used to satisfy validated requirements and hence reduce the required student load in graduate education for validated billets.

The degree completion programs are managed by the individual Military Departments and each has its own selection criteria. Generally, individuals are not selected for a program unless the education will enhance their professional development and be of use to the Military Department. All of the programs require an active service obligation payback from the individual.

Short course education provides the Military Services with needed skills in a wide variety of scientific, administrative and other fields. These programs are selected to train personnel in job-oriented skills that can best be acquired through abbreviated courses. Accounting, traffic management and aviation safety are examples of skills involved. Some of this training is conducted in DoD schools, some at civilian institutions.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VII-10. Training Input, Output and Load

Other Full Time Education Programs

Service Component	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	375	400	395	395	340	395	380	338
Navy								
Active	151	170	2,998	2,998	158	2,956	2,956	154
Reserve	3	3	275	275	3	275	275	3
Marine Corps								
Active	87	66	51	51	95	51	51	95
Air Force								
Active	377	328	6,757	6,757	284	6,757	6,757	284
Reserve	49	29	1,338	1,338	47	1,338	1,338	47
National Guard	12	22	275	275	10	275	275	10
DoD								
Active	990	964	10,201	10,201	877	10,159	10,144	871
Rsv/Guard	64	54	1,888	1,888	60	1,888	1,888	60
TOTAL	**1,054**	**1,018**	**12,089**	**12,089**	**937**	**12,047**	**12,032**	**931**

♦ ♦ ♦

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATION

This subcategory is made up of a wide variety of courses for personnel of all health professions; physicians, dentists, nurses, medical administrators, and so forth. The majority of the courses offered are conducted in military facilities and varies in length from a few days to a full year. Some training is conducted at civilian medical institutions and, in the case of the Army, includes some advanced degree programs. The purpose of Health Professions Education is to expand the skills of military medical personnel and to provide them timely information on the latest techniques in their fields. In this category, the Army and Navy provide long-term training. The Air Force relies on short courses. Educational programs connected with the acquisition of health professionals are carried in this report under Officer Acquisition Training. The following table shows load data for Health Professions Education Programs.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VII-11. Training Input, Output and Load

Health Profession Education

Service	FY 00 Load	FY 01 Load	FY 02			FY 03		
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army	1,422	1,422	516	397	1,518	474	398	1,594
Navy	298	161	195	185	236	195	185	236
Air Force	39	37	1,500	1,500	32	1,500	1,500	32
TOTAL	**1,759**	**1,620**	**2,211**	**2,082**	**1,786**	**2,169**	**2,083**	**1,862**

♦ ♦ ♦

CHAPTER VIII: TRAINING MANPOWER

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Manpower associated with the individual training mission in the Department of Defense can be divided into two parts: (1) trainees and students being trained, and (2) military and civilian manpower conducting and supporting the training. These two different classes of manpower are discussed and explained in this chapter.

TRAINEES AND STUDENTS

Manpower undergoing training in the Defense training establishment is defined and quantified in three different ways, each of which serves a somewhat different purpose with regard to manpower accounting and resource allocation.

- **Training Loads**. These are the "military training student loads" and were detailed by component in Chapters III through VII of this report. Training Loads represent the number of military trainees, students and cadets of each Service and component in training during a given fiscal year. Training loads include all military manpower of a given Service or component who are undergoing individual training in a centralized school or training center, regardless of whether the training is conducted by the parent Service, one of the other Services, a DoD school, or by an agency or institution outside the Department of Defense, such as a civilian college or university. Training loads also include all military personnel in training regardless of their assignment status. Some trainees and students are assigned in a Permanent Change of Station (PCS) status to the training activity. Others are attending training in a Temporary Duty (TDY) or Temporary Additional Duty (TAD) status while remaining assigned to their parent units. Still others are attending training while in transit from one permanent assignment to another.

  Since most courses are much shorter than a year in length, the actual number of students and trainees who enter training (or the number who graduate) is considerably greater than the training load. For example, the total programmed training load for Recruit Training in FY 2002 is 37,243 yet about 220,000 persons will enter Recruit Training and about 198,000 will graduate.

- **Training Workloads**. The total number of trainees and students undergoing training within DoD includes some trainees and students of foreign nations, DoD civilian employees, and members of other departments and agencies of the U.S. Government, notably the Coast Guard. In addition, many U.S. military students and trainees are trained by a Service other than their own.

Consequently, the cumulative number of students trained (or to be trained) by a given Service, or its training workload, usually differs from its training load. For example, the Marine Corps has a programmed Flight Training load of 507 in FY 2002. However, since the training is conducted by other Services, its Flight Training workload is zero. On the other hand, because the Navy trains many personnel from other Services and Coast Guard, foreign students as well as most of its own students, the Navy's Specialized Skill Training workload is higher than its training load.

Training workload, in conjunction with other applicable considerations, is the major determinant of the resources (manpower, funds, material and facilities) required to conduct training. It, rather than training load, is appropriately used in considering the allocation of resources to a Service or a training activity. The training workloads reported in the MMTR are the same as those reported in the ITRR, with the following exceptions: (1) Officer Acquisition for Military Manpower Training Report (MMTR) also includes USUHS and Other Medical Profession Acquisition; (2) Flight Training for the MMTR also includes Advanced Flight training; (3) MMTR includes Professional Development (the ITRR does not); (4) the ITRR includes Special Operations Command (SOCOM) and Army Reserve Component data (the MMTR does not).

Table VIII-1 displays the programmed military training workloads for each of the Services.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VIII-1. Training Workloads

(In Thousands)

Category / Fiscal Year	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
FY 02				
Recruit	14.2	9.5	8.6	5.0
Officer Acquisition	5.3	4.9	0.3	7.0
Specialized Skill	42.0	28.2	8.6	20.9
Flight	1.4	2.5	0.0	2.2
Prof. Dev. Educ.	2.2	2.2	1.2	5.3
OSUT	10.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	**75.4**	**47.3**	**18.7**	**40.4**

TABLE VIII-1. Training Workloads (Cont...)

(In Thousands)

Category / Fiscal Year	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
FY03				
Recruit	14.1	9.8	8.8	5.3
Officer Acquisition	5.6	4.9	0.3	7.0
Specialized Skill	42.3	28.8	8.8	20.9
Flight	1.5	2.7	0.0	2.1
Prof. Dev. Educ.	2.1	2.3	1.2	5.4
OSUT	9.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	**75.4**	**48.5**	**19.1**	**40.7**

♦ ♦ ♦

- **Students, Trainees and Cadets**. In the Individuals accounts of the Defense Manpower Requirements Report, military manpower is included for each Service as "Trainees and Students" and (except for the Marine Corps) "Cadets". Conceptually, this manpower represents the number of military trainees, students, cadets and midshipmen programmed to be assigned (PCS as opposed to TDY/TAD) for training on the last day of a given fiscal year. Student, trainee and cadet manpower is similar to training load in that both represent military members of the reporting Service in training status. Nevertheless, there are substantial differences in the way the amount of manpower in these two manpower aggregations is calculated, with the result that the totals are seldom the same. The major reasons for these differences are:
  - Training loads are man-years in training status, whereas trainees, students, and cadets are end strengths, or numbers in training on the last day of the fiscal year. Trainee, student, and cadet numbers are thus affected by the seasonality of enlistment patterns, as described in Chapter 3, while the element of seasonality is leveled out in training loads.
  - Training loads include students attending training in a temporary duty (TDY or TAD) status as well as those attending en route training in a PCS status. In the Defense Manpower Requirements Report, TDY and TAD students are carried in the categories of their parent units.

Training loads are a more accurate measure of the amount of training that is needed to meet military requirements than are numbers of trainees, students and cadets.

MANPOWER IN SUPPORT OF TRAINING

Military and civilian manpower is required to accomplish the individual training mission. This manpower performs all the other tasks necessary to conduct and support individual training conducted in training institutions, i.e., it conducts and supports instruction, operates training bases and facilities, maintains training equipment, produces training aids, provides personal and community services to students, trainees, and other military members, plans and manages training.

ROTC students are not military members in an active duty status and are not included in military manpower training loads. However, ROTC Basic Camp loads are included in the Army Recruit training loads because recruit training instructors and staff support and conduct that training. To be consistent with this treatment of ROTC students, manpower supporting the primary ROTC programs at colleges and universities is *not* included in Tables VIII-2 through VIII-5.

The following tables summarize manpower in support of training in three general functions: Conduct of Individual Training, Training Base Operating Support, and Management Headquarters. Conduct of Individual Training includes the following types of manpower: instructors, instructional support, school/training center staffs, student supervisors and direct training support such as training aids and literature, audiovisual resources and instructional systems development.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VIII-2. DoD Manpower in Support of Training

Conduct of Individual Training, (End Strength in Thousands)

Service	FY 99		FY 00		FY 01		FY 02		FY 03	
	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ
Army	19.5	5.2	21.8	5.3	22.8	5.3	21.6	5.3	21.7	5.3
Navy	24.8	3.2	15.7	2.9	18.0	3.2	14.2	3.0	16.5	3.0
Marine Corps	9.6	0.2	9.6	0.2	9.6	0.2	9.6	0.2	9.6	0.2
Air Force	13.7	4.5	11.1	4.2	12.3	4.5	11.3	3.8	12.1	3.7
TOTAL	**67.6**	**13.1**	**58.2**	**12.6**	**62.7**	**13.2**	**56.7**	**12.3**	**59.9**	**12.2**

♦ ♦ ♦

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VIII-3. DoD Manpower in Support of Training

Base Operating Support, (End Strength in Thousands)

Service	FY 99		FY 00		FY 01		FY 02		FY 03	
	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ
Army	8.3	11.5	7.5	10.9	5.7	8.8	5.9	8.5	5.8	8.3
Navy	2.3	3.3	1.3	2.9	1.9	2.6	1.5	2.2	1.1	1.9
Marine Corps	2.5	1.5	2.5	1.5	2.2	1.3	2.2	1.1	2.2	1.1
Air Force	6.4	5.3	4.7	5.0	5.5	5.6	3.7	3.9	4.4	4.0
TOTAL	**19.5**	**21.6**	**16.0**	**20.3**	**15.3**	**18.3**	**13.3**	**15.7**	**13.5**	**15.3**

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VIII-4. DoD Manpower in Support of Training

Management Headquarters, (End Strength in Thousands)

Service	FY 99		FY 00		FY 01		FY 02		FY 03	
	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ
Army	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.7	0.4	0.8	0.3	0.5
Navy	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.3
Marine Corps	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Air Force	0.8	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.8	0.5	0.8	0.5	0.7	0.5
TOTAL	**1.2**	**1.2**	**1.1**	**1.3**	**1.2**	**1.5**	**1.3**	**1.6**	**1.1**	**1.3**

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VIII-5. DoD Manpower in Support of Training

All Functions, (End Strength in Thousands)

Service	FY 99		FY 00		FY 01		FY 02		FY 03	
	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ
Army	28.1	17.3	29.6	16.7	28.8	14.8	27.8	14.5	27.8	14.1
Navy	27.1	6.7	17.1	6.0	20.0	6.2	15.9	5.5	17.7	5.2
Marine Corps	12.1	1.7	12.0	1.7	11.8	1.5	11.8	1.3	11.8	1.3
Air Force	20.9	10.3	16.5	9.7	18.6	10.7	15.8	8.2	17.2	8.1
TOTAL	**88.2**	**36.0**	**75.2**	**34.1**	**79.2**	**33.2**	**71.3**	**29.5**	**74.5**	**28.7**

♦ ♦ ♦

The Services' estimates of training attributable manpower include some staff and support manpower that do not contribute to the production of student output and loads. This manpower is reported as training resources in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) because they belong to organizations and units with a primary mission of training. The majority of the non-training attributable manpower is that portion of Base Operating Support (BOS) needed to support non-training tenant activities at training installations.

Table VIII-6 shows changes in total military and civilian manpower in support of training between FY 1991 and FY 2003.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VIII-6. Manpower in Support of Training,

DoD Total by General Function, (End Strength in Thousands)

Function	FY 91			FY 02			FY 03			Percent Change Total Manpower	
	Mil	Civ	TOT	Mil	Civ	TOT	Mil	Civ	TOT	FY 02/91	FY 03/02
Conduct of Indiv. Training	77.2	13.6	90.8	56.7	12.3	69.0	59.9	12.1	72.0	-24.0%	4.3%
Operating Support	35.2	37.2	72.4	13.3	15.7	29.0	13.5	15.3	28.8	-59.9%	-0.7%
Training Headquarters	1.3	1.4	2.7	1.3	1.5	2.8	1.2	1.3	2.5	3.7%	-10.7%
TOTAL	**113.7**	**52.2**	**165.9**	**71.3**	**29.5**	**100.8**	**74.6**	**28.7**	**103.3**	**-39.2%**	**2.5%**

♦ ♦ ♦

As Table VIII-6 shows, the total military and civilian manpower in support of active training institutions has decreased 39 percent between FY 1991 and FY 2003.

As shown in Tables VIII-7 and VIII-8, training workloads will be 1.7 percent lower in FY 2002 than in FY 1991.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VIII-7. Training Workload Trends

(In Thousands)

Service	FY 91	FY 02	FY 03	Percent Change	
				FY 02/91	FY 03/02
Army	78.9	75.4	75.4	-4.4%	0.0%
Navy	60.6	47.4	48.5	-21.8%	2.3%
Marine Corps	17.2	18.7	19.1	8.7%	2.1%
Air Force	28.3	40.3	40.7	42.4%	1.0%
TOTAL	**185.0**	**181.8**	**183.7**	**-1.7%**	**1.0%**

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VIII-8. Training Manpower and Training Workload Trends

(In Thousands)

Service	FY 91	FY 02	FY 03	Percent Change	
				FY 02/91	FY 03/02
Manpower in Support of Training	165.9	100.9	103.3	-39.2%	2.4%
Training Workloads	185.0	181.9	183.6	-1.7%	0.9%

♦ ♦ ♦

TRAINING MANPOWER DETAILED BY SERVICE AND TYPE OF TRAINING

Table VIII-9 shows the manpower required to support FY 2002 and FY 2003 training workloads by Service and training activity.

As was noted early in this chapter, training workloads, in conjunction with other factors, are the determinants of the resources required to conduct training. The workload/resource relationship is not a simple one, but depends upon the nature of training and training support involved. For example, Flight Training normally requires a great deal of support manpower for aircraft maintenance and weapons training requires close instructor supervision for safety considerations.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE VIII-9. Training Manpower by Service and Type of Training

Fiscal Years 2002 and 2003, (In Thousands)

Type of Training	Army		Navy		Marine Corps		Air Force		Total	
	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ
FY 02										
Recruit	2.9	0.1	1.2	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.4	0.0	7.4	0.1
Officer Acquisition	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.2	0.0	0.9	0.6	2.5	2.2
Specialized Skill	13.4	3.3	10.0	0.9	5.5	0.1	6.4	1.4	35.3	5.7
Flight	1.0	0.3	1.8	0.3	0.7	0.0	2.0	1.3	5.5	1.9
Professional Develop.	0.6	0.6	0.5	1.1	0.3	0.0	1.5	0.5	2.9	2.2
Army One-Station Unit	3.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.2
Direct Support	3.0	1.4	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.6	0.3	3.7	2.0
Base Support	2.9	7.0	1.5	1.9	2.1	1.1	3.1	3.6	9.6	13.6
Management Hdqs.	0.4	0.8	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.5	1.3	1.6
Total	**28.0**	**14.5**	**15.8**	**5.6**	**11.8**	**1.2**	**15.7**	**8.2**	**71.3**	**29.5**
FY 03										
Recruit	2.7	0.1	1.2	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.8	0.0	7.6	0.1
Officer Acquisition	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.2	0.0	0.9	0.7	2.5	2.2
Specialized Skill	13.5	3.2	12.3	0.8	5.5	0.1	6.9	1.3	38.2	5.4
Flight	1.0	0.4	1.8	0.3	0.7	0.0	2.0	1.1	5.5	1.8
Professional Develop.	0.6	0.6	0.5	1.1	0.3	0.0	1.5	0.5	2.9	2.2
Army One-Station Unit	3.2	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.3
Direct Support	3.0	1.4	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.6	0.3	3.7	2.0
Base Support	2.9	6.9	1.1	1.6	2.1	1.0	3.8	3.7	9.9	13.2
Management Hdqs.	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.5	1.1	1.3
Total	**27.9**	**14.1**	**17.7**	**5.2**	**11.8**	**1.1**	**17.2**	**8.1**	**74.6**	**28.5**

♦ ♦ ♦

Service estimates of training manpower include some staff and support manpower that do not contribute directly to the production of student output and loads but are reported as training resources in the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP) because they belong to larger organizations with a primary training mission.

Manpower data in the six categories of training, i.e., Recruit through One-Station Unit Training, includes instructors, school/training center staffs and student supervisors. Direct training support includes such tasks as training aids and literature, audiovisual resources, and instructional systems development.

CHAPTER IX: TRAINING MANAGEMENT AND FUNDING

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Chapters III through VII of this report described and explained military training student loads required for each military component. These student loads represent levels of training effort which require manpower and other resources. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the management of individual/ institutional training and the resources (other than manpower - which was covered in Chapter VIII) associated with the conduct of individual training.

STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES

Within the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), staff responsibility for individual training and education policy rests with the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), with a strong influence over the allocation and use of resources being exercised by the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller). These two offices work closely together in the staff supervision of DoD individual training and education. The OSD role is generally one of policy formulation, allocation of resources, overview of Service training programs and coordination among the Services.

Within each Service headquarters a principal staff officer has responsibility for individual training. Other staff members may have primary responsibility for certain types of training, for example, a Service Surgeon General for professional medical training. Other staff members have collateral responsibilities for the allocation of manpower and funds to the training function.

Primary responsibility on the Army staff for individual training rests with the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans and his subordinate, the Director of Training. Within the Navy, the principal staff officer is the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Manpower, Personnel, and Training. The Commanding General for Training and Education Command (TECOM) acts as the principal training advisor the Commandant of the Marine Corps, through the Commanding General, Marine Corps Combat Development Command (MCCDC). TECOM was established in July 2000, and simultaneously all Marine Corps training and education related activities were realigned under Training and Education Command. TECOM will remain subornidate to the Marine Corps Combat Development Command. Within the Air Force, the Director of Personnel Programs, under the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, has staff responsibility for individual training.

TRAINING COMMAND MANAGEMENT

Detailed management of individual training is carried out by the four Military Services. Each of the Services, except the Marine Corps, has a training commander immediately subordinate to the Service chief who is responsible for most of the individual training conducted within that Service. Some individual training is managed directly by the Service headquarters. However, the most prevalent pattern of control is through a training command headquarters that manages most Service military schools, training centers and other training facilities. The following Service command headquarters manage most of the individual training conducted by that Service:

- The Army's principal training command is Headquarters, Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), located at Fort Monroe, Virginia. TRADOC's control is exercised through training installations and school commanders throughout the United States.
- The Chief of Naval Education and Training (CNET), headquartered in Pensacola, Florida, exercises control of aviation education and training through a subordinate functional commander. For all other education and training under CNET's purview, CNET directly controls training centers, schools, and programs throughout the Navy.
- For the Air Force, Headquarters, Air Education and Training Command at Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, directly controls individual training centers and units.
- For the Marine Corps, the Commanding General Training and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia exercises command, operational control, technical directions, and/or coordination for all Marine Corps formal schools and training centers.

The Service-wide training commands are not responsible for all individual training and education conducted. As already noted, the Surgeons General are responsible for most health professional and medical technical training. Other examples include the Service Academies, which are under the direct supervision of the respective Service Chiefs.

The Services' training command commanders and the Commanding General for the Marine Corps Training and Education Command are also the senior members of the Interservice Training Review Organization (ITRO). The ITRO was formed in 1972 to facilitate cooperative training efforts among the Services. The committees and working groups of the organization perform the detailed analysis which becomes the basis for decisions on the feasibility of consolidation of training courses or other cooperative arrangements.

INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING FUNDING

In considering training resources, it is important to distinguish between the training loads required by a Service but conducted in part outside the Service, and the workloads representing training conducted by the Service. As discussed in the previous chapter, the workloads, which represent training conducted by a Service, are the basis for resource requirements (manpower, material, facilities and funds) needed to conduct and support the individual training that the Service executes.

TRAINING FUNDING AND COSTS

The training costs in this document include funding for military pay and allowances of assigned trainees and students, pay and allowances of military and civilian personnel in support of training, base operating costs, training related activities, training investment costs for construction and procurement, and overhead costs for training administration and command. Certain costs for activities at training installations support non-training missions (such as base operating support for non-training activities on training bases). These non-training costs are embedded in Program 8 and, therefore, are included in the costs shown in the tables in this document. Depreciation costs of training facilities and equipment are not included, although training investment costs estimated for FY 2002, such as procurement and construction costs, are included. This report uses the data in the DoD's Future Year Defense Program (FYDP) as the basis for estimates of the manpower and funds devoted to training and education. All funding displayed in this report is in then-year dollars.

For a given Service, the requirement for funding for training arises from two factors. First is the need to fund the pay and allowances of its own military training student loads, regardless of where or by whom the students are trained. Second, the need to provide for the level of individual training and education effort necessary to meet the Service's commitments to accomplish training for its own and other students.

Funding for individual training is shown each year in Major Force Program (MFP) 8 of the FYDP. A portion of the resources under MFP 8 is not directly related to individual training. The Services sometimes include costs in MFP 8 which support other training and activities in addition to individual institutional military training. These costs are related to audiovisual support, training developments, base operations, real property maintenance, and headquarters management type activities (specific Program Elements are listed in Appendix C).

For comparability, the funding requests associated with ROTC and other non-load training programs are deleted from the following tables. Hence, the following tables report FY 2002 and FY 2003 funding estimates that relate to the required training load requirements. Special caution should be exercised in using these costs for comparisons among Services. Differences in missions among the Services, differing operating and training conditions, and differences in the mix of Service training programs degrade the soundness of comparisons based on aggregated data such as these.

Table IX-1 shows Army funding for individual training by category.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE IX-1. Army Funding of Individual Training

(In Millions)

Training	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
Recruit Training	$332.5	$321.4	$425.3	$447.7	$431.7
Officer Acquisition Training	165.9	169.4	188.5	191.7	198.6
Specialized Skill Training	1,512.0	1,565.7	1,818.0	1,849.7	1,889.0
Flight Training	367.8	386.7	459.2	553.7	560.6
Professional Development Education	316.2	333.0	260.7	412.2	397.4
Army One-Station Unit Training	259.2	258.9	297.8	321.7	320.7
Direct Training Support	349.2	346.1	424.3	404.7	375.9
Training Base Support	1,570.0	1,557.0	1,223.4	1,178.9	1,186.2
Training Management Headquarters	69.9	59.2	84.9	85.2	66.7
Reserve Pay & Allowance	673.8	716.9	798.1	857.2	902.1
TOTAL	**$5,616.5**	**$5,714.3**	**$5,980.2**	**$6,302.7**	**$6,328.9**

♦ ♦ ♦

Within MFP 8, the Army funds the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC). This command is responsible for Army-wide requirements for audiovisual and visually based instructional materials used for training individuals or units of the Army as a whole. Training Development activities, under TRADOC, produce resident and non-resident training programs and materials to meet the needs of the Army in the field as well as individual training at the Training Centers and Schools. TRADOC also funds combat development activities. The management of HQ TRADOC is funded by MFP 8 as is the Real Property Maintenance (RPMA) and Base Operations (BASOPS) of all those posts designated as TRADOC installations. Although TRADOC installations may have tenants from other major commands, the RPMA and BASOPS are funded in MFP 8.

Tables IX-2 and IX-3 show Navy and Marine Corps funding for individual training by category.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE IX-2. Navy Funding of Individual Training

In Millions

Training	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
Recruit Training	$569.5	$511.9	$393.9	$431.4	$468.4
Officer Acquisition Training	219.8	216.6	267.6	272.2	286.0
Specialized Skill Training	1,736.4	1,711.8	1,545.3	1,654.3	1,621.0
Flight Training	964.1	1,170.4	1,121.7	989.9	1,146.0
Professional Development Education	245.1	260.3	173.6	182.4	299.3
Direct Training Support	164.2	217.4	195.6	175.0	211.1
Training Base Support	590.0	602.8	707.0	666.7	381.8
Training Management Headquarters	22.9	24.5	32.9	35.8	34.8
Reserve Pay & Allowance	19.5	18.1	21.2	22.8	33.3
TOTAL	**$4,531.5**	**$4,733.8**	**$4,458.8**	**$4,430.5**	**$4,481.7**

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE IX-3. Marine Corps Funding of Individual Training

In Millions

Training	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
Recruit Training	$442.0	$454.4	$417.9	$447.1	$464.8
Officer Acquisition Training	42.2	45.1	16.9	18.1	18.8
Specialized Skill Training	683.7	710.7	733.1	786.6	820.9
Flight Training	74.4	78.7	53.0	56.7	59.0
Professional Development Education	73.2	78.9	51.3	54.2	56.5
Direct Training Support	76.8	75.6	64.2	70.1	77.4
Training Base Support	262.1	247.9	260.8	198.8	244.8
Training Management Headquarters	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.3
Reserve Pay & Allowance	109.7	102.4	98.9	104.3	140.3
TOTAL	**$1,764.5**	**$1,794.2**	**$1,696.4**	**$1,736.2**	**$1,882.8**

♦ ♦ ♦

Table IX-4 shows Air Force funding for individual training by category.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE IX-4. Air Force Funding of Individual Training

In Millions

Training	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
Recruit Training	$182.0	$189.5	$189.5	$198.9	$236.8
Officer Acquisition Training	242.3	247.7	236.5	231.9	249.1
Specialized Skill Training	850.1	943.3	1,044.1	1,154.0	1,267.5
Flight Training	920.5	1,081.5	1,192.3	1,384.3	1,460.3
Professional Development Education	275.2	299.2	292.2	360.3	406.9
Direct Training Support	61.8	63.0	63.1	67.6	75.3
Training Base Support	902.9	853.8	1,008.2	784.8	839.3
Training Management Headquarters	82.8	81.7	87.9	92.0	97.2
Reserve Pay & Allowance	208.5	278.9	217.8	339.9	458.9
TOTAL	**$3,726.1**	**$4,038.6**	**$4,331.6**	**$4,613.7**	**$5,091.3**

♦ ♦ ♦

The funding tables in this chapter include student and trainee pay and allowances as well as pay and allowances for the staff and support manpower for each Service's training schools. This can produce significant distortions in the use of these aggregates for assessing training efficiency, e.g., in the Marine Corps; significant loads are trained by Army and Navy schools. Appendix A shows a distribution of funds for individual training by Service and appropriation. Funding of individual training for the four military Services is shown in Table IX-5.

♦ ♦ ♦

TABLE IX-5. Funding of Individual Training

By Service and Type of Training, (In Millions)

Fiscal Year / Type of Training	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force	Total
FY 02					
Recruit	$447.7	$431.4	$447.1	$198.9	$1,525.1
Officer Acquisition	191.7	272.2	18.1	231.9	713.9
Specialized Skill	1,849.7	1,654.3	786.6	1,154.0	5,444.6
Flight	553.7	989.9	56.7	1,384.3	2,984.6
Professional Development	412.2	182.4	54.2	360.3	1,009.1
Army One-Station Unit	321.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	321.7
Direct Training Support	404.7	175.0	70.1	67.6	717.4
Base Training Support	1,178.9	666.7	198.8	784.8	2,829.2
Training Management Hdqs.	85.2	35.8	0.3	92.0	213.3
Reserve Pay & Allowance	857.2	22.8	104.3	339.9	1,324.2
Total	**$6,302.7**	**$4,430.5**	**$1,736.2**	**$4,613.7**	**$17,083.1**
FY 03					
Recruit	$431.7	$468.4	$464.8	$236.8	$1,601.7
Officer Acquisition	198.6	286.0	18.8	249.1	752.5
Specialized Skill	1,889.0	1,621.0	820.9	1,267.5	5,598.4
Flight	560.6	1,146.0	59.0	1,460.3	3,225.9
Professional Development	397.4	299.3	56.5	406.9	1,160.1
Army One-Station Unit	320.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	320.7
Direct Training Support	375.9	211.1	77.4	75.3	739.7
Base Training Support	1,186.2	381.8	244.8	839.3	2,652.1
Training Management Hdqs.	66.7	34.8	0.3	97.2	199.0
Reserve Pay & Allowance	902.1	33.3	140.3	458.9	1,534.6
Total	**$6,328.9**	**$4,481.7**	**$1,882.8**	**$5,091.3**	**$17,784.7**

♦ ♦ ♦

Funding estimates in this document include substantial segments of cost, which are not normally sensitive to significant shifts (up to 15 percent) in training load. These include certain command, base, facility, and equipment costs. These "fixed" costs need to be considered in program and budget adjustments because, within a reasonable range of output, they remain approximately the same and do not vary as the training load varies. They change, instead, with decisions to change the manner of accomplishing training, most often through training investment decisions or base realignments and closures.

There are often substantial year-to-year fluctuations in funding for fixed costs. These costs are termed "fixed", not because they do not change from year to year, but because their changes characteristically are not "variable" with changes in workloads from period to period. Funding of these costs reflects significant increases for years in which there are major procurements such as simulators, aircraft, or construction in support of training.

Fixed cost has important implications on funding adjustments for changes in the level of activity or size of a training program. If training funds are to be adequate for the needs of a reduced program, they must be reduced by a smaller proportion than the reduction in training loads in order to account for fixed costs. By the same token, program increases, within reasonable capacity limits, may not require a proportional increase in total program funding.

APPENDIX A
Individual Training Funding
($ in millions)

A. SUMMARY OF TOTAL FUNDING BY SERVICE AND APPROPRIATION

Appropriation	FY 02	FY 03
Army		
Operation and Maintenance	$2,096.50	$2,239.10
Military Personnel	3,124.90	3,085.00
Reserve Personnel	375.6	430.60
National Guard Personnel	481.7	471.50
Air Craft Procurement	0	0.00
Missile Procurement	0	0.00
Ammunation & Weapon Procurement	0	0.00
Other Procurement	0	0.00
Military Construction	224.1	102.80
Subtotal	**$6,302.80**	**$6,329.00**
Navy		
Operation and Maintenance	$1,531.10	$1,463.90
Military Personnel	2,366.50	2,468.20
Reserve Personnel	22.8	33.30
Aircraft Procurement	306.9	441.70
Other Procurement	94.2	49.60
Military Construction	109.1	25.00
Subtotal	**$4,430.60**	**$4,481.70**
Marine Corps		
Operation and Maintenance	$234.70	288.50
Military Personnel	1,397.20	1,454.00
Reserve Personnel	104.3	140.30
Military Construction	0	0.00
Subtotal	**$1,736.20**	**$1,882.80**
Air Force		
Operation and Maintenance	$1,755.70	$1,846.00
Military Personnel	2,027.30	2,279.90
Reserve Personnel	146.7	205.50
National Guard Personnel	193.2	253.40
Aircraft Procurement	392.9	435.30
Other Procurement	19.9	14.40

APPENDIX A
Individual Training Funding
($ in millions)

A. SUMMARY OF TOTAL FUNDING BY SERVICE AND APPROPRIATION (CONT...)

Appropriation	FY 02	FY 03
Air Force (Cont...)		
Military Construction	77.9	56.50
Research & Development	0	0.30
Subtotal	**$4,613.60**	**$5,091.30**
TOTAL	**$17,083.20**	**$17,784.80**

B. O&M FUNDING FOR TRAINING AND EDUCATION BY CATEGORY AND SERVICE

Funding Category / Service	FY 02 Estimate	FY 03 Estimate
Recruit Training		
Army (1)	$29.3	$34.6
Navy	6.6	10.4
Marine Corps	10.5	10.5
Air Force	5.6	6.9
Subtotal	**52.0**	**62.4**
Officer Acquisition		
Army	$69.2	$77.0
Navy	96.0	115.9
Marine Corps	0.3	0.4
Air Force	66.2	69.3
Subtotal	**231.7**	**262.6**
Specialized Skill Training		
Army	$356.1	$415.3
Navy	266.5	302.9
Marine Corps	36.9	40.5
Air Force	297.3	294.5
Subtotal	**956.8**	**1,053.2**
Flight Training		
Army	$395.5	$402.5
Navy	369.6	371.1
Marine Corps	0.2	0.2

APPENDIX A
Individual Training Funding
($ in millions)

B. O&M FUNDING FOR TRAINING AND EDUCATION... (CONT...)

Funding Category / Service	FY 02 Estimate	FY 03 Estimate
Flight Training (Cont...)		
Air Force	668.4	669.5
Subtotal	**1,433.7**	**1,443.3**
Professional Development		
Army	$111.3	$116.2
Navy	117.3	137.2
Marine Corps	8.5	8.9
Air Force	110.3	136.3
Subtotal	**347.4**	**398.6**
Direct Training Support		
Army	$251.0	$221.5
Navy	170.7	209.1
Marine Corps	67.1	74.2
Air Force	30.7	33.4
Subtotal	**519.5**	**538.2**
Training Base Support		
Army	$824.3	$930.7
Navy	479.0	293.4
Marine Corps	111.3	153.8
Air Force	540.4	597.3
Subtotal	**1,955.0**	**1,975.2**
Training Management Headquarters		
Army	$59.8	$41.3
Navy	25.4	23.8
Air Force	36.7	38.7
Subtotal	**$121.9**	**$103.8**
TOTAL O&M		
Army	$2,096.5	$2,239.1
Navy	1,531.1	1,463.8
Marine Corps	271.5	327.2
Air Force	1,840.8	1,911.0
Total	**$5,739.9**	**$5,941.1**

APPENDIX B
Individual Training Workload and Training Staff By Training Category, FY 2001

Training Staff End Strength (E/S) includes instructors, school/training center staff and student supervisors. It does not include manpower for training support, training development, management headquarters and base operating support.

A. RECRUIT TRAINING

Service / Facility	Training Staff End Strength		
	Workload	Military	Civilian
Army (1)			
Fort Benning, GA	2,250	292	19
Fort Jackson, SC (2)	8,284	1,417	14
Fort Knox, KY	2,161	366	10
Fort Leonard Wood, MO (2)	2,124	433	19
Fort Sill, OK	2,250	372	0
Navy			
Great Lakes, IL	9,804	1,141	22
Marine Corps (1)			
Parris Island, SC	3,955	1,503	7
San Diego, CA	3,865	1,354	3
Air Force			
Lackland Air Force Base, TX	4,997	516	41

(1) The Army includes ROTC Basic Camp workload in their Recruit Training and workloads.

(2) Army Recruit Training facilities that train female recruits.

APPENDIX B

Individual Training Workload and Training Staff By Training Category, FY 2001

B. OFFICER ACQUISITION

Service / Facility	Training Staff End Strength		
	Workload	Military	Civilian
Army			
Fort Monmouth, NJ (Prep School)	185	13	18
Ft. Benning, GA (OCS)	220	37	3
West Point, NY (USMA)	4,029	540	131
Navy			
Annapolis, MD	4,297	255	351
Ft. Sam Houston, TX (Medical)	12	5	0
Newport, RI	488	23	28
Pensacola, FL	328	41	6
San Diego, CA (Medical)	14	1	0
Marine Corps			
OCS, Quantico	331	163	3
Air Force			
Colorado Springs, CO (AF Academy Prep Sch)	209	27	14
Colorado Springs, CO (AF Academy)	4,101	2,049	1,392
Maxwell AFB, AL (OTS)	305	97	15

C. SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING

Service / Facility	Training Staff End Strength		
	Workload	Military	Civilian
Army			
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD (Ordnance Sch)	2,571	634	161
DLI-FLC, Monterey, CA	3,350	197	953
Fort Benning, GA	2,955	2,103	187
Fort Bliss, TX	1,013	813	119
Fort Eustis, VA	2,109	774	221
Fort Gordon, GA	4,317	938	218
Fort Huachuca, AZ (1)	2,476	1,067	110
Fort Jackson, SC	3,261	804	90

(1) Fort Huachuca includes Army Management Structure Code (AMSCO) 321731, 321733 and 321734.

APPENDIX B
Individual Training Workload and Training Staff By Training Category, FY 2001

C. SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING (CONT...)

Service / Facility	Training Staff End Strength		
	Workload	Military	Civilian
Army (Cont...)			
Fort Knox, KY	1,368	2,091	186
Fort Leavenworth, KS	527	85	3
Fort Lee, VA	4,469	763	300
Fort Leonard Wood, MO	3,780	1,215	187
Fort Rucker, AL	932	296	70
Fort Sill, OK	1,544	546	89
Navy			
Athens, GA	317	40	16
Bangor, WA	501	350	53
Bethesda, MD (Medical)	37	26	4
Camp Lejeune, NC (Medical)	76	28	0
Camp Pendleton, CA	110	0	0
Camp Pendleton, CA (Medical)	91	44	0
Charleston, SC	2497	866	0
Cherry Point, NC	220	6	1
Dam Neck, VA	385	1250	90
Ft. Walton Beach, FL	321	125	15
Great Lakes, IL	4700	1109	54
Great Lakes, IL (Medical)	1,113	112	1
Groton, CT	1207	626	18
Groton, CT (Medical)	48	23	1
Gulfport, MS	458	200	33
Houston, TX (Medical)	61	11	0
Ingleside, TX	129	80	10
Jacksonville, FL	207	218	2
Jacksonville, NC	223	6	1
Kings Bay, GA	437	294	37
Lemoore, CA	187	184	2
Mayport, FL	205	126	15
Meridian, MS	523	69	19
Newport, RI	698	345	32
Norfolk, VA	1,629	868	76

APPENDIX B

Individual Training Workload and Training Staff By Training Category, FY 2001

C. SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING (CONT...)

Service / Facility	Training Staff End Strength		
	Workload	Military	Civilian
Navy (Cont...)			
Panama City, FL	206	191	14
Pearl Harbor, HI	277	255	28
Pensacola, FL	5,025	1,340	223
Pensacola, FL (Medical)	41	31	6
Port Hueneme, CA	300	95	48
Portsmouth, VA (Medical)	229	58	2
San Diego, CA	1,652	1,571	112
San Diego, CA (Medical)	407	92	6
Schenectady, NY	772	545	0
Whidbey Island, WA	168	158	0
Wichita Falls, TX (Medical)	176	44	0
Yorktown, VA (Medical)	70	12	0
Marine Corps			
MCAGCC, 29 Palms, CA	1,465	628	97
MCB, Camp Lejune, NC	3,122	1,219	50
MCB, Camp Pendleton, CA	2031	825	6
MCCDC, Quantico, VA	942	1,058	25
MCRD, Paris Island, SC	63	14	0
MCRD, San Diego, CA	304	48	0
Air Force			
Goodfellow AFB, TX	2,451	378	18
Keesler AFB, MS	5,932	832	435
Lackland AFB, TX	3,749	534	165
Sheppard AFB, TX (Med)	2,500	373	33
Sheppard AFB, TX (Ops)	6,840	894	224
Vandenberg AFB, CA	458	341	35

APPENDIX B
Individual Training Workload and Training Staff By Training Category, FY 2001

D. FLIGHT TRAINING

Service / Facility	Training Staff End Strength		
	Workload	Military	Civilian
Army			
Fort Rucker, AL (Advance/Graduate)	875	507	140
Fort Rucker, AL (Undergraduate)	510	466	74
Navy			
Corpus Christi, TX	374	333	72
Kingsville, TX	188	245	58
Meridian, MS	148	240	39
Pensacola, FL	1,087	425	100
Whiting Field, FL	782	423	55
Marine Corps			
Corpus Christi, TX (1)	0	90	0
Pensacola, FL (1)	0	637	6
Air Force			
Columbus AFB, MS (2)	398	589	41
Laughlin AFB, TX (4)	424	523	41
Randolph AFB, TX (5)	461	738	85
Sheppard AFB, TX (6)	235	362	45
Vance AFB, OK (3)	387	452	50

(1) Workload included in Navy Flight Training.

(2) Includes all sources of students (USAF, ANG, AFRC, INTL) for Preflight, T-37, T-38, T-1 and IFF.

(3) Includes all sources of students (USAF, ANG, AFRC, INTL) for Preflight, T-37, T-38, T-1 and FWQ.

(4) Includes all sources of students (USAF, ANG, ARC, INTL) for Preflight, T-37, T-38 and T-1.

(5) Includes all sources of students (USAF, ANG, AFRC, INTL) for Preflight, T-37, T-38 and IFF.

(6) Includes all sources of students (USAF, ANG, AFRC, INTL) for Jet Currency, Flight Screening, IFF, Med Fam T-37, ATM, Theater Ops, and EWO. Includes Air Force inter-service flight training staff assets at Fort Rucker, Corpus Christi, Pensacola and Whiting Field.

APPENDIX B

Individual Training Workload and Training Staff By Training Category, FY 2001

E. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION

Service / Facility	Training Staff End Strength		
	Workload	Military	Civilian
Army			
Fort Bliss, TX	1,143	166	13
Fort Leavenworth, KS	1,006	236	84
Navy			
Monterey,CA	1,307	102	348
Newport, RI	279	418	45
Norfolk, VA	227	66	24
Marine Corps			
MCCDC, Quantico, VA	497	139	38
MCB, Camp Lejuene, NC (SNCO)	217	46	0
MCB, Camp Pendleton, CA	207	46	0
MCB, Camp Butler JA	101	34	0
MCAS, Kaneohe Bay	19	15	0
MCAGCC, 29 Palms, CA (NCO)	37	19	0
Noncommissionned Officer Academies			
ANG McGhee Tyson, TN	91	24	0
Elmendorf AFB, AK	11	9	0
Goodfellow AFB, TX	42	12	0
Hickam AFB, HI	10	7	0
Kadena Air Base, Japan	38	13	0
Kapaun Air Base, GE	100	21	0
Keesler AFB, MS	91	18	0
Kirtland AFB, NM	55	14	0
Lackland AFB, TX	87	25	0
McGuire AFB, NJ	68	18	0
Mega NCOA, Maxwill-Gunter AFB, AL	43	12	0
Peterson AFB, CO	52	19	0
Robins AFB, GA	41	12	0
Tyndall AFB, FL	109	26	0
Airman Leadership School			
Altus AFB, OK	11	4	0
Anderson Air Base, GU	15	3	0
Andrews AFB, MD	21	3	0

APPENDIX B

Individual Training Workload and Training Staff
By Training Category, FY 2001

E. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION (CONT...)

Service / Facility	Training Staff End Strength		
	Workload	Military	Civilian
Airman Leadership School (Cont...)			
Aviano Air Base, IT	30	6	0
Barksdale AFB, LA	21	6	0
Beale AFB, CA	16	4	0
Bolling AFB, DC	7	4	0
Cannon AFB, NM	15	4	0
Charleston AFB, SC	16	6	0
Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ	24	4	0
Dover AFB, DE	21	6	0
Dyess AFB, TX	20	6	0
Edward AFB, CA	32	4	0
Eglin AFB, FL	69	6	0
Eielson AFB, AK	19	4	0
Ellsworth AFB, SD	16	4	0
Elmendorf AFB, AK	44	5	0
F. E. Warren AFB, WY	9	3	0
Fairchild AFB, WA	17	6	0
Fort Meade, MD	19	3	0
Goodfellow AFB, TX	5	3	0
Grand Forks AFB, ND	8	6	0
Hanscom AFB, MA	8	3	0
Hickam AFB, HI	18	7	0
Hill AFB, UT	19	5	0
Holloman AFB, NM	22	4	0
Howard, Panama Canal	12	4	0
Hurlburt Field, FL	8	7	0
Incirlik AFB, TU	11	3	0
Kadena AFB, JA	38	6	0
Kapaun Air Base, GE	66	7	0
Keesler AFB, MS	11	4	0
Keflavik, Iceland	2	3	0
Kirtland AFB, NM	7	4	0
Lackland AFB, TX	16	6	0

APPENDIX B
Individual Training Workload and Training Staff By Training Category, FY 2001

E. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION (CONT...)

Service / Facility	Training Staff End Strength		
	Workload	Military	Civilian
Airman Leadership School (Cont...)			
Langley AFB, VA	26	6	0
Little Rock AFB, AR	12	6	0
Luke AFB, AZ	22	6	0
MacDill AFB, FL	10	4	0
Malmstrom AFB, MT	8	3	0
Maxwell AFB, AL	10	5	0
McChord AFB, WA	13	6	0
McClellan AFB, CA	17	3	0
McConnel AFB, KS	15	6	0
McGuire AFB, NJ	19	7	0
Minot AFB, ND	18	6	0
Misawa AFB, JA	20	5	0
Moody AFB, GA	22	4	0
Mountain Home AFB, ID	19	4	0
Nellis AFB, NV	24	6	0
Offutt AFB, NE	29	7	0
Osan, Korea	33	4	0
Patrick AFB, FL	4	3	0
Peterson AFB, CO	14	4	0
Pope AFB, NC	21	4	0
RAF Lakenheath, UK	67	8	0
Randolph AFB, TX	10	4	0
Robins AFB, GA	34	4	0
Scott AFB, IL	16	3	0
Seymour Johnson AFB, NC	16	4	0
Shaw AFB, FL	21	5	0
Sheppard AFB, TX	11	3	0
Spangdahlem Air Base, GE	45	7	0
Tinker/Vance AFB, OK	75	6	0
Travis AFB, CA	37	8	0
Tyndall AFB, FL	10	4	0
USAF Academy, CO	8	3	0

APPENDIX B
Individual Training Workload and Training Staff By Training Category, FY 2001

E. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION (CONT...)

Service / Facility	Training Staff End Strength		
	Workload	Military	Civilian
Airman Leadership School (Cont...)			
Vandenberg AFB, CA	10	4	0
Whiteman AFB, MO	12	4	0
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH	33	4	0
Yokota Air Base, JA	15	4	0
Other Professional Development Education			
Gunter Annex, AL	172	54	4
Maxwell AFB, AL	1079	350	101

F. ONE-STATION UNIT TRAINING (OSUT)

Service / Facility	Training Staff End Strength		
	Workload	Military	Civilian
Army			
Fort Benning, GA	2,981	997	29
Fort Knox, KY	1,687	947	79
Fort Leonard Wood, MO (1)(2)(3)	3,203	705	36
Fort Sill, OK	628	435	16

(1) Fort Leonard Wood includes Engineer, Military Police and Chemical schools.

(2) Facilities open to female soldiers.

APPENDIX C
Institutional Training
Resource Program Elements

Training Category	Program Element Title	Program Element
Recruit	Recruit Training Units	804711
Officer Acquisition	Service Academies	804721
	OCS/OTS	804722
	Other College Commission Program	804724
	Naval Science Maritime	804725
Specialized Skill	General Skill Training	804731
	General Skill Intelligence Training	804733
	Cryptological Skill Training	804734
	Undergraduate Space Training	804735
Flight	New AETC Aircraft Systems	804740
	Undergraduate Pilot Training	804741
	Undergraduate Navigator Training	804742
	Other Flight Training	804743
	EURO-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training	804744
	Undergraduate Pilot Training –Strike	804745
	Undergraduate Pilot Training – Maritime	804746
	Undergraduate Pilot Training – Rotary	804747
	Flight Screening	804748
	Instrument Flight Center	804749
Professional Development	Professional Military Education	804751
	Other Professional Education	804752
Multiple Category	Integrated Recruit and Skill Training (OSUT)	804761
Direct Training Support	Support of the Training Establishment	804771
	Training Developments	804772
	ATC/Ground Support Training	804773
	Operational Hq Tech Training	804775
	Operational Headquarters (Flying Training)	804777

APPENDIX C
Institutional Training
Resource Program Elements

Training Category	Program Element Title	Program Element
Training Base Support	Minor Construction RPM	805776
	Maintenance and Repair RPM	805778
	Real Property Services (RPS) - Training	805779
	Visual Information Activities	805790
	Base Communications	805795
	Base Operations	805796
	Minor Construction RPM - SA	805876
	Maintenance and Repair RPM Service Academies (SA)	805878
	Real Property Services (RPS) - SA	805879
	Visual Info Activities - SA	805890
	Base Communications - SA	805895
	Base Operations - SA	805896
Training Management Headquarters	Management Headquarters	805798